

c.a.u.t.  
BULLETIN  
de l'a.c.p.u.

DECEMBER

1968

DÉCEMBRE

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Case History

Patterns of University-Government Relations in Canada

The 1967-68 Saskatchewan Government-University Controversy

The Place of the Faculty Association in University Government

Report on the Ontario College of Art

Removal of Censure of Simon Fraser University

VOLUME 17 TOME

NUMBER 2 NUMÉRO

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS  
ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ

# CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

<b>Association</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Secretary</b>	<b>Treasurer</b>
1. Acadia	John Connor	Hartford Graham	David E. Misener
2. Alta. Edmonton	D. G. Fisher	A. S. Little	A. S. Knowler
3. Bishop's	C. L. Arnot	M. Rhodes	R. F. Barnett
4. Brandon	J. T. McNeely	E. M. McFadden (Miss)	M. Tyler
5. U.B.C.	Bill Webber	Mrs. Anne Brearley	R. D. Russell
6. Brock	Richard Hiatt	Howard E. Bell	Howard E. Bell
7. Calgary	Karl Friedmann	Horst Betz	Peter Glockner
8. Carleton	T. J. Scanlon	B. G. O'Neil	D. K. Bernhardt
9. Dalhousie	Mark Segal	J. Farley	M. J. L. Kirby
10. Guelph	K. J. Duncan	S. Sidlofsky	R. M. Liptrap
11. Jean-de-Brébeuf	R. Bergeron	Gisèle Gariépy (Soeur)	
12. Lakehead	Donald Orr	D. Syposz (Mrs.)	Stan Magwood
13. Laurentian- Laurentienne	Gerald Vallilee	Michel Perrault	K. L. McNamara
14. Lethbridge	James Penton	Mr. Martin A. Oordt	Dr. Keith McCurdy
15. Loyola	R. Hanrahan	G. Andersen	L. Boyle
16. Manitoba	Charles M. Dowse	J. Tinkler	E. J. Ashworth
17. McGill	W. A. Westley	Frank Innes	R. M. Johnstone (Mrs.)
18. McMaster	B. A. W. Jackson	Maureen Halsall	J. Liefeld
19. Memorial	J. Tague	M. Brewster	J. A. Cook
20. Moncton	Victor Ross	Jean Dumas	Jean-Guy Gagnon (Rev.)
21. Montréal	L.-Philippe Taschereau	G. de Montigny	Jacques Falmagne
22. Mount Allison	John W. Boyle	Liliane Welch	Liliane Welch
23. U. New Brunswick	Douglas Brewer	Ryllys Cutler	D. D. Kristmanson
24. Notre Dame of Nelson	Gordon Petter	Mrs. P. J. Scheffer	A. Bartsch
25. Nova Scotia Tech.	G. D. MacKay	E. A. Guppy	E. A. Guppy
26. Ottawa	G. Kaplan	Wilfrid Dubé	Jean-Marc Beauchesne
27. Queen's	J. Downie	M. W. Edwards	W. E. Watt
28. R.M.C.	D. H. Rogers	L. Brault	C. W. Newcombe
29. St. Dunstan's	Fred Driscoll	G. W. Pineau	G. W. Pineau
30. St. Francis X.	Walter Kontak	A. Balawdyer	A. Balawdyer
31. St. John's	Rev. A. M. C. Waterman	J. Kindle	Mrs. M. Gutkin
32. St. Mary's	Urhan S. Merdsoy	Hugh D. Cochrane	Hugh D. Cochrane
33. Sask. Regina	R. Robinson	M. Alexander (Miss)	M. Alexander
34. Sask. Saskatoon	L. F. Kristjanson	J. E. Kennedy	J. C. Courtney
35. Simon Fraser	Milton McClaren	David E. Pownall	J. S. Barlow
36. Sir Geo. Wms.	M. Marsden	A. Jordan	A. Dickie
37. Toronto	M. F. Grapko	E. Schabas	R. A. Collins
38. Trent	Bruce Hodgins	Richard B. Morris	James Nighswander
39. Victoria	J. E. Hendrickson	Jean D. Dey	W. Gordon
40. Waterloo	Robert Y. M. Huang	J. B. Capindale	J. J. Byerley
41. Waterloo Lutheran	John Weir	Frank Turner	James Kitchen
42. Western	C. C. Bigelow	Richard C. Hodgson	J. Humphrey
43. Windsor	Gordon Wood	A. Owen Klein	Ralph Kolinski
44. Winnipeg	H. V. Rutherford	S. G. Wall	R. B. Coates
45. York	F. Schindeler	H. T. Wilson	Harvey Simmons

**Members-at-large — Membres individuels**

<b>association</b>	<b>président</b>	<b>secrétaire</b>	<b>trésorier</b>
--------------------	------------------	-------------------	------------------

**ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ**

# c.a.u.t. BULLETIN de l'a.c.p.u.

December 1968 Décembre

Volume 17, Number 2

tome 17, numéro 2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS — TABLE DES MATIÈRES

	PAGE
The Work of the C.A.U.T. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure .....	J. Percy Smith 2
The Pattern of University-Government Relationships in Canada .....	R. D. Mitchener 12
The Government-University Controversy in Saskatchewan, 1967-1968 .....	John C. Courtney 19
Within or Without : The Location of the Faculty Association .....	W. B. Cunningham 34
Consultation and Participation : A Report on the Ontario College of Art .....	Edward J. Monahan 46
A Footnote to Confederation : Why was University Education made a Provincial Responsibility ? .....	R. D. Mitchener 54
Book Reviews — Notes de Lecture The Strength of the University .....	56
Notice of Positions Vacant — Annonce des postes vacants .....	58
Notice of Persons Available for Appointment — Annonce des professeurs disponibles .....	63
Removal of Censure of Simon Fraser University .....	Centerspread

*A Publication of The Canadian Association of University Teachers  
Publié par l'Association canadienne des professeurs d'université*

Executive Secretary:

Secrétaire général :  
J. Percy Smith

Editor:

Directeur :  
Edward J. Monahan

C.A.U.T. National Office  
233 Gilmour St., Ottawa 4, Ont.  
Advertising Office:

Secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U.  
233, rue Gilmour, Ottawa 4, Ont.  
Publicité :

233 Gilmour St., Ottawa 4, Ont.

Published four times a year in October,  
December, February and April.  
Subscription Rate : \$5.00 per year.

Quatre livraisons par année : octobre,  
décembre, février et avril.  
L'abonnement est de \$5.00 par année.

Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa and for payment of postage in cash.

Le ministère des Postes a autorisé l'affranchissement en numéraire et l'envoi comme objet de deuxième classe de la présente publication.

# THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

J. Percy Smith

When the *Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure* was adopted, about a year ago, the opinion was expressed that a review of the work of the A.F. & T. Committee would be useful to all C.A.U.T. members. The principles and recommendations embodied in the *Statement* had been thoroughly discussed by faculty associations throughout Canada, as well as by the Council that officially approved it; they were, however, mainly drafted by the Committee, and based on the work done by it in recent years. It is common knowledge that the Committee, in so far as it has any choice in the matter, does its work confidentially. It therefore seemed desirable that an analytical and anonymous report should be provided, as a means of informing C.A.U.T. members and others about this important Association activity.

## Number

In making this review, I have considered 87 appeals that were made to the C.A.U.T. national office from 1961 to September 1968. From a statement in the *Bulletin* for December 1962, it appears that about ten cases had been dealt with before 1961, but the records are unsatisfactory and I shall not consider them here; nor shall I make reference to the considerable number of problems that have been carried no further than a single telephone conversation or interview. Also, several appeals have been made since the current academic year began, to which no further reference will be made. The following table shows the number of appeals that have arisen, by year of origin:

1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
4	2	3	6	9	17	21	25

The sharp rise may be accounted for by several facts: the great increase in faculty, and especially the increase in proportion of non-tenured faculty; the increased recognition of the Association as an effective force in dealing with problems of individual faculty members; the growing recognition of the rights of faculty members and the nature of their relation to the university. The figure for 1968 covers only nine months; it should be noted, however, that eleven of the 25 appeals (in that period) arose at a single institution. To some extent it was possible

to deal with them *en bloc*, but they involved separate files and separate correspondence, and I have accordingly counted them separately.

Not all the cases were considered by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. A few appeals were withdrawn or abandoned after preliminary discussion with the National Office. All were discussed by the Executive Secretary and the Chairman of the Committee; all were at least reported to the Committee.

### Distribution (geographic)

Geographically, the cases are distributed as follows:

Atlantic Provinces	Quebec and Ontario	West
15	49	23

The distribution roughly reflects the distribution of university enrolment. A more detailed analysis is undesirable at present, but it must be recorded that only a handful of the 46 institutions whose faculty associations are now affiliated with C.A.U.T. have had no cases brought to the latter body; and appeals have come from individuals at several institutions not now connected with the Association, and have been responded to when response was possible.

### Distribution (by discipline)

Humanities	Natural Sciences	Social Sciences	Professional	Others
36	21	18	8	4

For this distribution, Mathematics has been included in the Natural Sciences, History in the Humanities. "Others" involve persons such as librarians, who do not fit into the usual categories.

### Distribution (by rank)

Instructor and Lecturer	Assistant Prof.	Associate Prof.	Professor	Others
16	28	15	15	13

It is hardly surprising that there should be a considerable number of cases in the first two categories, since these ordinarily comprise faculty members without tenure, and the failure to grant tenure is one of the commoner causes of appeal. The more surprising fact is the distribution through the ranks above the level of Assistant Professor. Although not all the "Others" are so placed, several are Deans. Some are visiting professors, librarians, etc.

## Distribution (by sex)

Thirteen appeals came from females, seventy-two from males. Two have, for purposes of this report, been treated as group appeals.

## Subjects of Dispute

It will have been recognized that some rather rough-and-ready categorizations have been used in preparing this report. This fact is partly a reflection of the purpose of the report, which does not appear to call for greater refinement, partly of the difficulty of carrying the refinement further with advantage. The latter difficulty is more serious as one attempts to classify the sources of disputes that are brought to the Association. For almost every case has special characteristics that seem to demand qualification of any simple descriptive heading. The following figures should be read with that fact very much in mind.

Subject of Dispute	No. of Appeals
Termination of contract other than dismissal	36
Dismissal	16
Refusal of promotion	3
Refusal of tenure	8
Improper interference with teaching or research	10
Salary matters	15
Fringe benefits	1
Other	15

The last of these categories includes, for example, complaints by department heads against supposedly improper interference by administrative officials in connection with such matters as appointment and promotions; complaints against interference by boards of governors in academic matters; complaints by faculty members who have been denied normal participation in departmental affairs; and so on.

It will be noted that the total of these figures is not identical with the number of cases; this is so because a considerable number of disputes prove to have more than one subject. It should be noted also that it is not always possible to distinguish between "termination of contract other than dismissal" and "refusal of tenure".

## Level of dispute

I attempted to classify the disputes according to whether they involved the faculty member mainly with his department, his dean, or the administration of the university itself. This proved a difficult task.

For example, a dispute about a decision to deny tenure, since the latter is (or should be) the decision of a committee acting on behalf of the institution, seems to belong in the third category, and I have included such disputes in that class. Nevertheless, there is no denying that behind such decisions lies frequently a departmental dispute. Indeed, a large proportion of cases belong in more than one category. The following figures should be considered with reservations of that sort in mind:

<b>Department</b>	<b>Faculty or College</b>	<b>Institution</b>
19	6	61

The numbers do not total 87 because one case that the Association dealt with involved mainly a body outside the university; it was nonetheless an affair of academic freedom.

#### **Locus of first appeal**

The following table shows to whom an appeal was first addressed, in so far as this can be determined from the records. The first heading refers to grievance committees or other such bodies established independently of the faculty association; the second refers to individual administrative officers, such as a dean or president, to whom a request for review or investigation was first addressed.

<b>University</b>	<b>Faculty</b>			
<b>Committee</b>	<b>Administrator</b>	<b>Association</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>C.A.U.T.</b>
5	10	28	1	43

#### **Action taken by C.A.U.T.**

When a request for help or intervention is first received by the C.A.U.T., the first action is normally a request by the Executive Secretary for a complete written chronological account of the grievance, accompanied by whatever documentation may be available. The completion of this assemblage of materials is likely to require several exchanges of letters, with perhaps a telephone call or two. The salutary exercise of describing his problem occasionally leads a faculty member to change his mind about pursuing it.

The Executive Secretary reports every case to the Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure as it arises. He ordinarily does this by telephone, then sends to the Chairman photocopies of all letters and documents received from the appellant. If on the completion of the documentation, some immediate action can be taken, the Chairman and Executive Secretary will agree on that action

and will pursue it. It may, for example, involve writing letters of enquiry to the president of the university in question or to the president of the faculty association, or arranging a visit to the campus for an on-the-spot enquiry. Such action — or further action — may, however, await a decision by the Committee itself, if the Chairman and Executive Secretary feel this to be advisable. The Committee receives reports on all cases; ratifies or criticizes the action taken; and instructs the Chairman and Executive Secretary as to the course they should follow. On some occasions it becomes particularly appropriate for a member of the Committee other than these two to carry out an on-the-spot investigation.

The following table indicates in how many cases the various actions so described have been taken. It is to be kept in mind of course that most cases involve more than one of the actions, and that about a dozen cases included in this survey have not yet been resolved. It should also be remembered that at any stage the Committee may conclude that the appellant has no case, and decide against pursuing the matter further; and, equally, that the appellant himself may decide to withdraw.

<b>Dealt with by Chairman and Executive Secretary, reported to Committee</b>	<b>Full consideration by Committee, and decision on action to be taken</b>	<b>On-the-spot Investigation</b>
48	39	13

#### Outcome of cases

The following table represents an attempt to state in summary form the final disposition of cases that have been terminated

<b>Withdrawal by appellant or failure to pursue</b>	<b>Departure of Appellant</b>	<b>Committee decision that no action was justified</b>
16	5	23
<b>Termination by local university action</b>		<b>Claim to Promotion, Appointment or Tenure supported</b>
3		9
<b>Claim to Promotion, Appointment or Tenure not supported</b>		<b>Financial settlement arranged</b>
8		15

It will be noted that almost one-half the cases (16 plus 23) did not develop before the Committee. Some of these evaporated rather quickly. Many, however, involved very considerable correspondence

and discussion before the decision about them was reached. It is perhaps worth recording that the 87 cases have involved, on an average, the exchange of twelve letters each, in addition to a considerable quantity of documentation, and several long distance telephone calls.

Financial settlements have been arranged in certain cases where faculty members were, in the judgement of the Committee, being insufficiently compensated (or not compensated at all) for inadequate notice of non-renewal of their contracts, improper dismissal in circumstances that made reinstatement impossible, etc. Such settlements have varied greatly in amounts, ranging from a few hundred dollars to a full year's salary.

Among other effects of the Committee's case-work, it should be noted that eighteen of the cases led to revision of (or in some instances adoption of) procedures for dealing with the granting of tenure, promotions, etc., decisions on non-renewal of appointments, and appeals made by faculty members in connection with these matters. Sometimes such developments have come about after the Committee had addressed strong letters to administrative officers or boards of governors; sometimes universities have recognized their need and proceeded without such prodding.

Association members should be reminded also that the concern of the Committee, like that of the C.A.U.T., is the health of the university community. It follows that the Committee does not ask, before taking an interest in an appeal, whether the appellant is a member of the Association; nor does it at any time press him to become one. No record is kept, in this matter; but I estimate that about one case in three concerns a person who is not a member when he makes his appeal. Nor are the majority of the non-members persons who withdraw before any great amount of work has been done.

The Committee, which comprises ten members from widely separated campuses, meets regularly three or four times a year at week-ends. Many of the appeals brought before it require months (and sometimes years) of negotiation before settlement is reached, and a great part of the agenda is occupied by them. On the average, there have been upwards of a dozen of these before the Committee at its meetings in recent years. In addition, the Committee was largely responsible for the development of the *Policy Statement*, and has given careful attention to questions raised in connection with the interpretation and implementation of it; and it regularly deals with enquiries related

to its areas of concern, including matters referred to it by the Executive and Finance Committee. At the most recent meeting, the agenda contained 22 items, 18 of which were appeals at various stages of handling.

Those, then, are data emerging from a review of the C.A.U.T. files in this area of work. It may be useful to make the figures more colorful — and perhaps more meaningful — by outlining some specific problems that have come before the Committee (keeping in mind the desirability of anonymity). Occasionally, of course, a case that has been publicly discussed is made the subject of a full review in the C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*; no reference needs to be made here to such cases.

A. An Assistant Professor, after four years of service at his institution, took a year's leave of absence at half pay in order to complete his doctorate. He did so with the full approval of his institution. About half way through the year, he was informed, in response to an enquiry that he made about his future status, that the institution did not intend to continue his appointment and did not wish him to return. The grounds given had to do with his previous academic record.

After careful investigation, the Committee determined that, although the institution in question appeared to be without a satisfactory tenure policy, the correspondence leading to the individual's appointment clearly indicated that a tenured position was intended. It determined also that the individual had gone on leave on the clear understanding that he would return to his institution. Since, however, it became clear that non-academic considerations had assumed a large and troublesome role in the affair, the Committee decided to attempt to negotiate a financial settlement, and succeeded in doing so.

B. An individual was appointed Assistant Professor at a university where the probationary period was two years. He was not told that the appointment was probationary until three months after he had taken up his duties. When he was so informed, however, he made no objection. About a year after his appointment became effective, he was informed that at the end of the second year his contract would not be renewed. The situation was complicated by disputes that had broken out in which slanderous statements about him were alleged to have been circulated. Not long before the end of the second academic year he appealed to the Committee on the ground that he had not understood that his appointment was probationary at the time when he took it up,

and that his career had been jeopardized by the supposedly slanderous statements.

The Committee concluded, after much correspondence, that although the university was at fault in failing to inform him at the outset that his appointment was probationary, it had nevertheless done so soon after he took up his post, and his failure to question the matter until a further eighteen months had elapsed implied acceptance of probationary status; the Committee took the view also that it could not appropriately intervene in a situation where slander was alleged, this being the business of the courts.

C. A faculty member complained to the Committee that grades that he had given in a class that he taught had been altered considerably, in what appeared to be a haphazard fashion, without his being consulted and by means of procedures that were far from clear.

The Committee, after investigation, concluded that, since the faculty member had left the institution before reporting the affair, and since moreover it had been given wide publicity in the student newspaper and the daily press, there was no effective action that it could take with regard to the immediate problem. It urged on the institution that it should adopt appropriate procedures for dealing with grades, comparable with those in effect at other universities; and, in response to a query by the head of the institution, it stated emphatically that such matters as these came within the scope of the Committee's concern.

It seems undesirable and unnecessary to provide further illustrations from the C.A.U.T. files. The cases described indicate some of the questions that the Committee has had before it: In the absence of clear tenure arrangements, what are a university's responsibilities to faculty members where tenure is concerned? Conversely, what are the responsibilities of a faculty member in regard to the details of his own appointment? To what extent may non-academic considerations be taken into account when dealing with appointments, promotions, etc? To what rights is a faculty member entitled when he is given an appointment? Under what circumstances, and by whom, may his exercise of his profession be interfered with?

The *Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure* arose from a great many discussions of questions such as these, and long

consideration of the best means of forestalling problems, and of dealing with those that could not be headed off. Although the *Statement* was given its essential form by the Committee, it was reviewed and discussed by faculty associations throughout Canada, and rewritten several times in the light of that review and discussion, and the criticisms and suggestions that were elicited. It has as its object the protection both of the freedom of the faculty member and of the quality and integrity of the university. It emphasizes the importance of procedures rather than the definition of rights and principles, because the Committee and the Association became convinced that attempts at the definition of freedom are all too likely to prove to be moves in the direction of destroying it.

One question that arises with disturbing frequency is not, and probably cannot be, touched on directly by the *Statement*. This has to do with the extent to which a faculty member who has encountered difficulties at a university — which may well have been largely of his own making — is to be penalized, and his subsequent career jeopardized, wherever he may go. No one would challenge the right of an appointments committee to enquire about the past history of a candidate whom the committee is considering. Both the answering of such enquiries and the weighing of answers received are matters of the most serious responsibility, however. The Executive Secretary is approached from time to time by faculty members who have appealed to the C.A.U.T. for help and have subsequently been convinced — rightly or wrongly — that they were in effect being “blackballed” in their efforts to obtain appointments. It is only too possible that in some instances their assumption is right. Certainly there is no doubt about their personal anguish. It was in part concern for such persons that led the Association to state its belief that a faculty member to whom tenure is denied, or whose contract is not renewed, should have the right to a clear and unequivocal statement of the reasons — *if he asks for it.*

The provision of such a statement directly to a faculty member is not a libellous act, as some administrators seem to fear. The prospect of being asked to provide it would have a salutary effect on the making of decisions in which considerations that are not strictly academic are significant.

Finally, it is appropriate to add two comments that the Committee has made repeatedly. One is that every university ought to make

certain that its medical insurance provides appropriate coverage for faculty members who may fall prey to the physical or mental disorders that are among the special hazards of academics, particularly in the midst of the stresses that arise in the contemporary university. The other is that every faculty member ought to recognize that the premature publicizing of an individual problem is only too likely — by distorting the facts and obscuring the issues — to hamper very greatly efforts that might be made on his behalf by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

J. Percy SMITH,  
Executive Secretary.

# THE PATTERN OF UNIVERSITY-GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIPS IN CANADA \*

R. D. Mitchener \*\*

The lead article in the December 1957 issue of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada's *University Affairs*, in announcing a \$150,000 Ford Foundation grant to finance a study of relations between universities and governments in Canada, concluded by saying:

"Relations between governments and universities have become more difficult in the last decade because of the vast increase in spending on higher education. Governments are anxious to account to the taxpayer; universities are anxious that increased government support shall not lead to decreased academic freedom."

This statement, while pointing out two major problems in any proposed solutions leading to resolving the relationships, does oversimplify the matter. University education in any province is only a part, though at present the largest part, of the whole range of post-secondary education, and cannot be isolated from total provincial plans for post-secondary education opportunities. Later I will refer to the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, 1967. Suffice to say now that government support of universities tends at present to mean provincial support.

I cannot dispute that governments are anxious to account to the taxpayer (even if the taxes we pay are often juggled between various levels of government), or that a concentration of support by one level of government can, at least in theory, lead to increased control unless adequate safeguards are built into the processes by which financial support is given to institutions. The concept of "academic freedom" — which can be defined differently by governing bodies, administrators, teaching staff, and students — must have adaptability and responsibility as part of its makeup. The safeguards now being developed are provincial higher education or post-secondary education commissions. Monologue is being replaced by dialogue between universities and governments.

These commissions have been described as buffers between universities in a province, and provincial government education and finance

\* This is a slightly edited version of a paper presented originally at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association of University Business Officers, held at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, on June 11 and 12, 1968. Subsequent changes in legislation and personnel, etc. have not been included. Ed.

\*\* Mr. Mitchener, a Life Member of the C.A.U.T., is attached to the Support Branch for Higher Education, Secretariat of State.

departments. They normally have provincially-appointed or approved members representing government, education, and community interests. Their terms of reference are, in general, to advise the government on development of provincial university, or post-secondary, resources; to advise on and sometimes to distribute financial assistance required; and to plan together with the institutions the implementation of programs to meet the expanding education needs of the province.

Before proceeding, I can't help but plead that as more and more provinces move to meet their own expanding needs for post-secondary education, they collectively help meet the expanding needs of the country as a whole. In some cases these later needs could be different in emphasis from individual provincial needs, and, I submit, may not be able to be met by massive infusions of money, from whatever sources, into separate provincial systems without inter-provincial co-operation and planning. The central government, concerned as it is with such areas as manpower utilization and economic and social development could, and I think should, be an active partner with the provinces in making a thoroughly proper accounting to the taxpayers who do pay both provincial and federal taxes.

Enough preaching. We are faced with rapidly increasing enrolments and costs in our universities, and the provinces are trying to coordinate allocation of financial and course resources. How are they doing this?

In *Newfoundland*, with one university, there seems to have been no need yet for any separately constituted advisory board. The recent report of the Newfoundland Royal Commission on Education and Youth has, however, suggested a system of regional colleges throughout the province, and could point the way to such an organization being established.

*Prince Edward Island* now has two universities, and if present proposed legislation is effected, will soon have one. A bill to establish a university grants commission was introduced earlier this year but was withdrawn in favor of one to establish a commission on post-secondary education after intense debate which seems to have hastened the government's decision to combine the two universities into one, and to establish a college of applied arts and technology.

*Nova Scotia* established an advisory University Grants Committee in 1963, charged with inquiring into the financial support of Nova Scotia universities and some other post-secondary institutions, as well

as of institutions outside the province which serve substantial numbers of Nova Scotia students. It was also asked to study curriculum offered, standards required, and facilities for pursuing the courses offered; to study ways of avoiding duplication of courses and facilities; to study possible areas of cooperation among institutions; and to advise on distribution of provincial funds. The Committee issues annual reports wherein it makes recommendations to the government and the institutions. The 1967 report indicates that its financial recommendations to the province have been acted on more readily than some of its recommendations to institutions. Dr. Norman MacKenzie is chairman of the six-member commission.

In *New Brunswick*, following publication of a report in 1967 by a committee, chaired by Dr. John J. Deutsch, on financing higher education in the province, a commission on post-secondary education was formed. The commission includes a chairman (J. F. O'Sullivan) and eight other members from the education, business, professional and labour fields. The name was subsequently changed to the New Brunswick Higher Education Commission. Its objects and purposes are to advise the government on the needs and appropriate patterns of future development (including financial and student aid) of all forms of post-secondary education, and to plan with the institutions the development of post-secondary education. It is also responsible for payment of actual payment of government operating and capital grants.

*Quebec* has a Director-General of Higher Education in its Department of Education, and a sub-committee of the advisory Superior Council on Education concerned with higher education. I understand that an office or council of higher education, quite like a university grants commission, is likely to be established by legislation this year. In the past three years an advisory committee appointed by the Ministers of Education and Finance has made recommendations on levels of operating budget grants which, for 1968-69, to judge from the reaction of the heads of the English-language universities in the province, were not heeded in total by the provincial government. The massive restructuring of the Quebec education system, especially up to the pre-university level (to the equivalent of the 13th year of schooling) which is now being implemented following the report of the Parent Royal Commission on Education, has made education the top provincial priority. Grants for "catching-up purposes" to the French-language institutions, and the establishment of colleges of general and vocational education (CEGEPs) which are to be the funnel through which students

go on to university, are two developments that cause large demands on the provincial education funds.

*Ontario*, in the late 1950's, established an inter-departmental committee on university affairs reporting directly to the premier. In 1961 this was replaced by an Advisory Committee on University Affairs and in 1964 the provincial government established the first Department of University Affairs in the country. The Minister of Education is at present also the Minister of University Affairs. At this time the advisory Committee on University Affairs was re-organized to include laymen and educators. Dr. D. T. Wright is chairman of the committee. A report on its work, and on that of the Department of University Affairs, since their inception, is to appear shortly — probably this month. The committee has been active in developing formulae for operating grants and for capital assistance. It acts in an advisory, and not an executive, capacity. As with the case of other advisory provincial bodies, its role requires delicate balance and the ability to maintain confidence of both the universities and the government.

In 1965 *Manitoba* established a Council on Higher Learning to study and advise on needs in post-secondary education. It had members named by the university and affiliated colleges, and the Minister of Education. In 1967, when two of the colleges were elevated to university status, a statute established a provincial University Grants Commission, which would determine operating and capital grant payments to be made to higher education institutions through a provincial University Grants Fund. The Commission was also charged with studying the requirements of the province for post-secondary education at the universities and affiliated colleges in terms of the kind, quality and quantity required; and the capacity of the institutions to provide such education to meet provincial needs. The Commission comprises nine members, including Scott Bateman, Deputy Minister of the Manitoba Development Authority, as chairman, with academic, business and professional representation, and one other deputy minister. I understand that the role of the Council on Higher Learning may be diminished as a result of the creation of the commission. One controversial clause in the University Grants Commission Act related to approval of the commission before an institution "establishes, offers, provides, or creates, any new service, facility or program of studies; or extends or expands any service, facility or program of studies involving monies at the disposal of the commission." A similar clause had appeared in the first Prince Edward Island bill mentioned

previously. While the bark may be worse than the bite, and while a province should, I feel, have responsibility in curtailing unnecessary proliferation and duplication of courses, such a clause (which perhaps in less obvious language could be read into provisions in other provincial grant commission legislation) does indicate the great need for close cooperation and understanding among universities and between them and provincial governments.

*Saskatchewan*, like Newfoundland, has one provincial university. It does not have a university grants commission as do most other provinces. Last fall Premier Thatcher announced that all but emergency school and university construction would be frozen and indicated that the budget of the university would fall under tighter provincial government control in the same manner that all government spending departments were answerable to the legislature. Outcry from several quarters, especially against the latter proposition, was rapid and loud, despite assurances that this tighter financial control did not mean diminished university autonomy. Here again is a possibility of arbitrary action which a provincial government could exercise. A legislature, assuming the role of a grants commission, could do harm without proper understanding of the role of a university. I should add that there was no change in the method of voting funds by the legislature during the year just ended. Some years ago I recall that the University of British Columbia was almost closed by the provincial authorities.

*Alberta* now has three universities. It established a Universities Commission in 1965 when the second university, the University of Calgary, was established. Dr. W. H. Swift became chairman of the commission, and after his retirement this year was succeeded by Dr. Andrew Stewart. The role of the Commission is to examine university operating and capital financial requirements and needs, to advise the government on grant allocation, and to allocate funds voted by the legislature to the institutions. In 1967 a provincial board of post-secondary education was established to advise the Department of Education on the scope and financing of junior colleges, and with the Universities Commission, on general post-secondary education needs. Dr. G. L. Mowat, a professor of education at the University of Alberta, was appointed chairman of the board.

During the 1960's, *British Columbia* increased its number of universities from one to four, and like Alberta, is instituting a network of community and junior colleges in the province. In 1964 a govern-

ment-sponsored advisory academic board and a financial advisory board were established to assist in co-ordinating higher education in the province. S. N. F. Chant, former dean of Arts and Science at the University of British Columbia, was made chairman of both. Recently a Division of University Affairs was established in the provincial Department of Education, and I have just learned that a five-member grants commission (composed of representatives of the three public universities in the province, the Deputy Minister of Education, and Dean Chant) is about to be established.

This very brief review of provincial higher education agencies should show that developments in the provinces are tending to run parallel, although they are at different stages of maturity. Problems that the agencies have include the finding of equitable grants for operating purposes (often related to determining methods of formula financing related to student numbers), to proper assessment of capital needs, and to the necessity of total post-secondary education planning to include provision for non-university post-secondary education as well as university education.

Stated as simply as possible, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, 1967 is a vehicle through which federal transfers of fiscal resources are made to assist the provinces in meeting the rising costs of post-secondary education. The Act makes provision for the provinces to receive, for 1967-68, the higher of \$15 per capita of population or 50 per cent of eligible operating expenditures of post-secondary education institutions. Three provinces (Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick) were in 1967-68 on the \$15 per capita rate. Escalation of the per capita base in future years is to be based on the national rate of increase of eligible costs. When any of these three provinces have this rate equal to or exceeding the 50 per cent figure, they will move to this latter base. Movement, however, can only be to the 50 per cent base. Post-secondary education is defined as every course of studies that requires for admission the attainment of a level not lower than that of junior matriculation in each province. Thus the expenditures of the senior matriculation high school year are eligible for inclusion in calculating total resource transfers. To be eligible under the Act, post-secondary courses are to be of not less than twenty-four weeks duration and are to be certified as such by provincial authorities.

The Act specifies what expenditures are not considered as operating expenditures of post-secondary institutions. These include amounts expended for student financial aid; for the capital cost of land, buildings,

physical plant, facilities or equipment (except as otherwise provided by regulation); for interest on capital debts; for depreciation on buildings, physical plant, facilities or equipment; for prescribed ancillary enterprises undertaken or operated by an educational institution; and for amounts expended on or on account of rent on land, buildings, physical plant, facilities or equipment as might be prescribed. Also to be deducted are amounts received by institutions for assisted, sponsored or contract research; other amounts received from federal sources except as otherwise provided by regulation; and amounts paid to the province by federal sources that were prescribed to be amounts paid in respect of operating expenditures of post-secondary education.

Total transfers (and these are unconditional transfers to the provinces) including tax abatement, equalization, and adjustment payments (these adjustment payments are the amounts needed to bring the tax transfer and equalization amounts up to the \$15 or 50 per cent figure) were initially estimated to be about \$345 million for 1967-68. This figure now seems low.

The Department of the Secretary of State administers the adjustment payments, and the regulations and accounting procedures required under the Act.

In conclusion, I should mention some of the general criticisms directed at these fiscal arrangements by university or provincial government representatives:

- 1) With federal per capita grants to universities no longer being paid, the universities now must deal directly with their provincial governments for all government support (excluding research, of course);
- 2) The revenue transfer to the provinces is seen as purely a fiscal arrangement, and not as actual cost-sharing in post-secondary education;
- 3) The provinces want simpler arrangements with respect to administration of the Act and regulations;
- 4) At least one province has questioned university involvement in what is seen as provincial or perhaps Council of Ministers of Education responsibilities with respect to federal-provincial negotiations for post-secondary education assistance in whatever form the negotiations take;
- 5) There is concern about split responsibilities between finance or treasury, and education, departments in dealing with the Act.

Ralph D. MITCHENER.

# THE GOVERNMENT-UNIVERSITY CONTROVERSY IN SASKATCHEWAN, 1967-1968

John C. Courtney \*

On October 18, 1967, one week following the re-election of his government in a provincial general election, the Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Ross Thatcher, delivered a major address to the Potashville Educational Association Annual Convention in Regina. Regarding education in general and the University of Saskatchewan in particular, Mr. Thatcher stated :

... Our educational priority must be related to the financial capacity of the taxpayer. There is evidence that today the ceiling on that capacity may be close at hand. People everywhere are more and more concerned at the staggering annual increases in costs of education.

... Our Government is concerned by the fact that today the elected representatives of the people have virtually no control over university spending. Year after year, with few details, we in fact almost write a blank cheque. This is not too serious when only a few million dollars were involved. But today the University is fast becoming one of our largest spending departments. Under the circumstances, we intend at the next Session to reform our *University Act* in a major way. Final details have not been worked out. But, in essence, the University will be obliged to make its financial requests to the Legislature in the same manner as any other spending department. For example, they will have to request so much for salaries, so much for travelling, so much for new buildings, etc. I wish to emphasize that the Government will not interfere with the internal operations of the University. But, from this time forward, there will be direct financial control.

With that statement, a controversy involving the university, the government and the Saskatchewan public was sparked. Although various statements and "agreements" were released from time to time during the months following the Premier's October speech by both government and university officials, it was not until the presentation of the Budget to the Legislature in early March that a position relatively satisfactory to all parties concerned with the dispute had been reached. Even then, several unanswered and by no means insignificant questions remained.

The controversy involved, primarily, three separate groups: the government (as represented by the Premier, his cabinet and the Liberal MLA's), seeking to bring about a fundamental alteration in the relationship of government to university in the province; the Chancellor, the

\* Dr. Courtney is Assistant Professor of Economics and Political Science at the University of Saskatchewan (Saskatoon).

Board of Governors and the President, representing one part of the university;<sup>1</sup> and the faculty and students representing the other. Both university groups sought, more or less, to preserve the existing system, arguing that it would continue to serve the university and the province as well in the future as it had in the past. However, they chose tactics and strategies quite independent of one another, giving rise to the distinct impression that the university did not speak, at all times, with one voice. This study is concerned with an examination and an assessment of those tactics.

The government's position and arguments were the most curious of the three. What motivated the government to seek the change in its relationship with the university was a matter for considerable speculation and uneasiness. No one questioned the government's right to protect the interests of the taxpayer. The issue was clearly one of defining the best means for that protection. Contradictions in the government's arguments contributed significantly to the uneasiness. For example, the Premier's statement that the government would not interfere with the internal operations of the university was open to challenge when he based his policy on the assumption that the university was simply one of a number of government departments which, in future, would be required to make financial requests of the Legislature in the same manner "as any other spending department."

Following an early post-Potashville meeting with the Chancellor, the President and Chairman of the Board of Governors, the Premier repeatedly denied any lack of confidence in the Board and Administration saying they had carried out their duties with "responsibility and efficiency." Yet the Attorney General (without citing any supporting evidence) publicly charged that "many examples have been given to the government of the lack of planning and inefficient use of public funds [on the part of the university]." The newly appointed Minister of Education, Dr. McIsaac, denied that the government would determine the maximum number of faculty to be hired by the university, yet this did little to allay the fears of those who had become exercised by the Premier's earlier comment that "we will tell the university how many they will employ, for how much money, and it is up to the university to say who they will employ." Mr. Thatcher and his cabinet ministers were publicly at odds with one another, a fact which only contributed to the variety of the reasons suggested for the government's move toward

---

<sup>1</sup> Recognizing the dangers and difficulties inherent in oversimplifications by catch-all terms, this group shall, nonetheless, be referred to as the "Board-Administration" group.

"direct financial control" of the university. The government's objectives and arguments, it became obvious, were neither well-defined in advance nor totally understood by all participants on the government side during the controversy.

Members of the government repeatedly stated that they had no intention of, in the Premier's words, "amending the *University Act* or of introducing administrative procedures that will in any way affect the autonomy, independence, or internal management of the University." The Attorney General allowed that he "could not continue to be a member of a government which was seeking to place this university in a straight jacket," and the newly elected Liberal MLA from City Park-University (the riding which encompasses the Saskatoon campus of the university) assured his constituents that he would cross the House to sit as an independent Liberal rather than vote to reduce the autonomy of the university. "Politically," he added, sensing the immediacy of the issue in his constituency, "[the government's proposal] has done this seat a lot of harm." Why was it, then, that such assurances proved to be unacceptable to many members of the university community? The answer seemed to lie in the assumption on which the assurances were based: the government would acquit itself commendably if only it were given a chance. Faith in the government's intentions would be justified. In the words of the Attorney General, Mr. Heald: "I would like to suggest to you that you adopt a wait-and-see attitude because I am convinced that in the long run the proposed changes will be in the best interests of the university."

This sort of attitude, the Dean of the College of Law, Otto Lang, told the Minister of Education publicly, was of the sort Hitler had used as he marched over people in Europe, and was clearly unacceptable to those desirous of protecting the university's autonomy. Those genuinely concerned over the fate of the university did not want statements promising non-interference when the nature of the legislation and budgetary changes were unclear. They could not accept such statements on blind faith alone for they were wary of accepting politicians' promises for the future.

More particularly, they were wary of accepting promises from a governing party of which several prominent members had displayed a penchant for what could only be regarded as anti-intellectualism. Failing to comprehend what the Faculty Association of the Saskatoon Campus was attempting to accomplish during the height of the controversy

with periodic press releases over the name of its chairman (J. M. Naylor), the Premier commented : "If Professor Naylor would forget politics and concern himself more with the university, everyone would be better off."

The Minister of Public Works, Mr. Guy, addressing a Liberal constituency meeting on the basis of "personal comments" and not "government policy", criticized the university's faculty for wanting to educate the public "with the NDP story." It made him "literally sick to see professors spending time discussing Vietnam and their rights, yet not being available for classes." If the faculty continued to act in this way "then the time will come when we have to take over academic control as well as financial control." The faculty, he claimed, "should clean its own house before starting to worry about finances which are none of their business." During the Throne Speech debate of February, 1968, one Liberal MLA wondered aloud in the Legislature whether the cost to provincial taxpayers of educating foreign students at the University of Saskatchewan could be defended "at a time when our university is faced with massive increases in enrolment and the accompanying problems of providing the necessary staff and facilities, and at a time when we are short of teachers, nurses, dentists, etc., in our own province. Are we justified in utilizing these scarce staff and facilities to train so large a group of foreign students rather than train an additional 1,500 of the sons and daughters of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan ?" "It is difficult to say" he stated, without giving an answer to his earlier question, "whether or not people of Saskatchewan, through their elected members, should have any influence on decisions made within the university." With this sort of attitude displayed by some members of the governing party, it is hardly surprising that genuine alarm was voiced over the government's proposal to assume "direct financial control" of the university. But the central question still remained. Why ? What motivated the government to seek the change ? What were its intentions ?

On the face of it, it would seem that the government's purpose in seeking to change its relationship with the university was based on a two-fold desire. First, the government wished to acquire some measure of control over *both* the amount of money spent by the university and the way in which that money was to be spent. This is the only interpretation that can be given to the Premier's statement that "year after year, with few details, we in fact almost write a blank cheque." Second, the government wished to present in a more detailed form the university estimates to the legislature "primarily for information purposes." There

was a good deal of speculation about other possible reasons the government may have had,<sup>2</sup> but there was no factual evidence to support such conjectures. In any event, it was the forementioned two points that came under such strong attack by defenders of the university who, as it turned out, divided quite unintentionally into two rather distinct groups : faculty-students and Board-Administration. The ways in which these two camps chose to present their respective cases to the government and the public serves as a timely commentary on intra-university as well as extra-university relationships.

Faculty-student reaction to the Premier's speech was immediate and predictable. The Faculty Association on both campuses (Regina and Saskatoon) issued statements objecting to the Premier's "blank cheque" statement, arguing that great care is taken in preparing a detailed budget within the university for presentation by the Board of Governor to the Cabinet for its consideration. The Cabinet may, and in fact has, from time to time, cut the total amount requested by the Board from the provincial government. The total grant of public money to be spent by the university remains firmly in the hands of the cabinet, the Association argued, thereby denying any truth to the claim that the government has "virtually no control over university spending." Faculty similarly challenged the Premier's thesis that legislative financial control would not mean academic control. "The power to approve or to disapprove of budget requests attached to specific academic programs or colleges or courses of study obviously determines those programs, and inevitably places the government in the position of making the University's most important academic decisions," stated a press release by the Dean of Arts and Science at the Regina campus. Basing their case on the two essential points that (a) adequate government controls exist at the present time to protect the taxpayer in financing higher education, and (b) legislative control of the university would endanger its academic independence, the faculty and students had to wrestle with the question of how best to present their case to the public.

The first task of the Faculty Association (and my discussion in this respect will deal almost exclusively with the Saskatoon experience for it

<sup>2</sup> The art critic for the *New Statesman* met with the Premier in Regina while on a Canadian tour and reported in the December 22, 1967, issue of his magazine that Mr. Thatcher is a "clever, cocky, extrovert reactionary who talks contemptuously about 'intellectuals' and 'co-ops' in the same breath. He told us exultantly that he was bringing the University to heel and compelling the Board to itemise their requirements for the coming year so that he could cut out all the 'frills' which many think will include any activity he associates with 'dangerous ideas'. I was told afterwards by one of Thatcher's henchmen that a Professor at the University had even entertained hippies and that that sort of thing would have to stop."

is that to which I was closest) was to decide upon tactics for presenting its opposition to the government's proposals. Initially the Chairman of the Faculty Association met privately with the President of the University (and several subsequent informal meetings were held between senior Administration and Faculty Association representatives) promising faculty support for policies designed to defend the autonomy of the university.<sup>3</sup>

A general meeting of the Faculty Association held a week following the Premier's announcement had two essential purposes: to provide factual information for the membership and to give direction to the Association's executive for further action. It was important that the faculty be made totally aware of the present budgetary processes (both within the university, and between the university and government), the Premier's statement, the changes he contemplated in university-government relations and the likely effect of those changes on the university. This was done by the presentation of background reports on the university's history, the current budgetary process and recent developments concerning university autonomy in Saskatchewan by three members of the Association. Considerable discussion of various proposals for Association action was followed by the unanimous adoption (with 250 members present) of several resolutions. The Association (1) indicated that it would support the University's President fully in a strong stand in opposition to the proposed changes; (2) affirmed its conviction that the control of internal university budget allocations should remain in the hands of an autonomous Board of Governors, and opposed any changes in the University Act or in governmental practice which would detract from that control; (3) authorized its executive to make the Association's position known not only to the Board and the Government but to the public as it appeared necessary and appropriate to do so; and (4) instructed the executive to strike a special advisory committee to deal with the issue by conducting a campaign of public information.

The meeting was a success. The morale of the faculty had been strengthened by giving positive and united direction to what had previously been nothing more than the variegated feelings and emotions of individual faculty members. The term "Faculty Association" took on new meaning for many who previously had associated that name with little more than working conditions and terms of employment. To achieve unanimity from a body composed of so many notoriously self-

<sup>3</sup> Clearly no agreement exists on the precise meaning of such terms as "autonomy of the university" and "academic freedom." Nothing made that more evident than the careless way in which these and other terms were bandied about during the controversy by all concerned.

sufficient and independent parts attested to the genuine fear on the part of the faculty of the implications inherent in the Premier's proposals.

What of tactics? It did not require much knowledge of Saskatchewan politics to predict that Mr. Thatcher would have had little patience with a university group which he might choose to identify with the NDP. Therefore it became imperative that the controversy *not* be transformed into a political one in the partisan sense. To this end it proved to be helpful to have a not insignificant part of the Faculty Association's work done by, and important resolutions at meetings introduced by, people who were widely recognized as being supporters of the Liberal Party. Personal contacts between faculty members, Liberal MLA's and Cabinet ministers in the form of telephone calls, letters, and social engagements provided valuable informal channels for the communication of information and the expression of opinions.

One tactic that ultimately generated a good deal of public interest in the controversy (an essential prerequisite to the satisfactory solution of the controversy in the Association's mind) was the publication and distribution of a pamphlet entitled "Crisis at the University of Saskatchewan: At Stake — A Responsible, Independent University, or, A University Run as a Government Department." The pamphlet, of which 40,000 copies were printed, was distributed to members of both Faculty Associations, press, radio and television stations across Canada, students and members of the employees unions on both campuses, all Saskatchewan MLA's and MP's, and 12,000 alumni of the University of Saskatchewan. The pamphlet was designed by a special Faculty Association Committee on Public Education, a group which also established a "Speaker's Bureau" of faculty members available, on short notice if necessary, to speak on the controversy to groups within the province. The Saskatoon campus' Student Representative Council presented its case in a four-page pamphlet circulated amongst the students early in December with the hope that they would take the pamphlet home over Christmas vacation for their parents' perusal and consideration. Both faculty and student publications summarized the government's position as well as their own and argued that the quality of higher education in Saskatchewan would suffer from government interference in university operations.

What faculty member could remain true to himself, his colleagues, his students, by retaining his position in any university subservient to any government? What would a degree from such an institution be

worth? What department head could, in all honesty, recruit new staff for a university no longer free of government interference? Such were typical questions being asked by faculty and students. The installation of the Saskatoon campus' first Principal, Dr. R. W. Begg, on December 8, afforded Professor J. E. Rempel the opportunity to state publicly, in the presence of the Premier, thoughts shared by his colleagues. Bearing greetings from the Saskatoon Faculty Council, and addressing his remarks to Principal Begg, Professor Rempel stated in a speech that brought a standing ovation from the audience at its conclusion:

This University has been from its very beginning a fellowship of teachers and scholars — thinking, working, lecturing, in freedom. But the financial needs of the modern university are staggering. The current dependence on Government for funds poses, as we all know, an eventual threat to the autonomy to this University. I would not be honest with myself or with my colleagues if I did not acknowledge that for the last month or two this matter has caused us deep and painful anxiety. It is my privilege to assure you that in all measures that you take to preserve academic excellence and integrity we will support you firmly and loyally.

Contact with the public was vital, faculty and students felt, for without genuine public involvement in the university's future, the university would not be worth saving. This was particularly so in a province with a history of active individual and group participation in community affairs. What came as a shock to faculty and students, however, and what gave rise to additional uneasiness amongst many members of the university community, was the fact that public pronouncements, statements and press releases indicating a concern on the part of the Board and Administration equal to that of the faculty and students were not forthcoming.

"The Sounds of Silence" took on particular meaning in Saskatchewan during the winter of 1967-1968. Not once from the beginning of the dispute in late October to its conclusion in early March did the university's President or Board of Governors issue a statement disputing any of the Premier's Potashville remarks (remarks which Mr. Thatcher reiterated on more than one occasion). President Spinks, in fact, was quoted in the press the day following Mr. Thatcher's October 18 speech as saying he was "pleased the Premier [was] giving top priority to education" and ten days following the speech as saying he himself "was 'playing it cool' as he did not believe there was any threat to academic freedom." When the Chairman of the Faculty Association on the Saskatoon Campus was attacked by the Premier in a public statement,

it was the Dean of Arts and Science not the President's Office or the Board of Governors who came to his defence by stating in a press release that the Faculty Association Chairman's duties "are recognized to be a legitimate and indeed important part of the service he gives to the university." When the foreign student program at the university was questioned by a government MLA it was the Dean of Graduate Studies who came to its defence, not the Chancellor, or the Chairman of the Board, or the President. When the Dean of Arts and Science at the Regina Campus was charged by the Deputy Premier with deliberately distorting facts concerning federal-provincial contributions to university finances in a public address, no Board member or senior Administrative Officer came to Dean Berland's defence in spite of the fact that, as the Principal of the Regina Campus was to state subsequently, the comments themselves revolved around a "question of interpretation of figures." If so, why should the university *not have pointed out* that the figures were open to interpretation *at the time* the Dean's remarks were disputed? Why did the Chancellor suggest so emphatically at the time of Principal Begg's installation that everyone concerned in the dispute should direct his energies to his primary responsibilities, concluding that "silence would indeed be a virtue"? Why was nothing to be said? Was nothing to be done? Was nothing done? So far as the public was concerned the dispute was between the faculty-student body and the government, not the "University" and the government, and this did not augur well for the future of the university, faculty members maintained.

The Board-Administration policy, decided upon shortly after the Premier's October 18 speech, consisted almost exclusively of direct contact between the Board and senior university administrative officers on the one side, and the relevant Cabinet ministers (the Premier, Provincial Treasurer, Minister of Education and two or three others) and senior permanent government officials on the other. The discussions were private, followed occasionally by joint university-government statements or agreements. The policy was one of confidential negotiations between top-level officials in the university and the government. It constituted a conscious search for a solution to the differences of opinion by avoiding, almost at all costs, or at least relegating to the position of final option, public confrontation. It ignored the need to establish formal channels of communication with faculty and students by which they might be consulted and their advice might be given.

There were, in fact, two significant exceptions to the policy of quiet diplomacy on the part of the university Administration. One came

in the form of a terse, six-sentence press release issued by the Chairman of the Board, the Chancellor, and the university President protesting against a rather confused statement of the Premier's (which had set forth the government's objectives and which clearly ran counter to an earlier agreement reached by the Board with the government). The press release concluded with the comment that "the Board will not accept any conditions that in its opinion compromise the autonomy of the University." This was reassuring. The other was the widely publicized installation address of Principal Begg, which set forth clearly and forcefully, in the presence of the Premier, both the rights and responsibilities of the university and the freedoms required for those rights and responsibilities to be discharged properly. The University of Saskatchewan must have the freedom

to make our own decisions, and to set our own priorities, implying the freedom to control our own finances. I would like to state very emphatically that both the derivation and control of the budget of the University of Saskatchewan have been in very capable hands, and the taxpayers have received great value for limited dollars when compared with other major institutions. Our methods of budgetary control are equal to, or better than, many of those found in government and industry. I do not have the time to make more than a categorical statement in this regard, but I would be happy to accept any challenge of these statements.

We quite appreciate the government's problem of increasing costs in education, and the inflationary trends. We are prepared at all times, as in the past, to provide to the government detailed explanations of the basis of our budgetary request, and recognize that they must establish the level of the grant made to the University for both operations and capital. We must establish the level of the request, to reflect our needs, and make any necessary adjustments to a reduced budget. It is probable that the intensity of the debate will relate to the magnitude of the request, *but we must be the University advocates.* (italics added).

... Many members of the University are concerned about the establishment of any external controls which could be benign and general in the beginning, but could become specific and rigid, and impose very serious restrictions on the activities of the University. If the University is not free to make its internal financial decision, then it is not free to implement academic decisions.

... I am convinced that the members of universities, by virtue of their training, their background, their interests, and indeed their dedication, are in a better position to guide these institutions than are the members of any government.

It was abundantly clear where the new Principal stood. The speech (coming as it did from a man who was moving out of faculty and into

administration) took on added importance, for it came from the person who, more than anyone else, could bridge the gap between faculty-student and Board-Administration.

To many faculty and students the effect of the policy of quiet diplomacy was disturbing; to others it was demoralizing. The role played by the newspapers in the dispute did not help matters. The Regina and Saskatoon newspapers (both Sifton papers) gave editorial support to the government's proposal for greater protection of the taxpayer's money on the condition that (in the words of the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*) the government ensured "that the university retains full internal independence." Their support of the government continued throughout the whole of the controversy even though dozens of letters to the editors were published, and numerous reports were carried in those same newspapers of statements and speeches, all pointing out dangers inherent in the Premier's proposals. It was scarcely realistic to expect the newspapers to do otherwise than support the government in light of the quiet diplomacy policy. Newspapers have become so reliant on press statement released by News and Information Officers of universities that they are unprepared to cope with a flood of statements, press releases and letters from university sources other than those "officially recognized." There is a sense of legitimacy about Administration News Stories that does not carry over to press releases from other university quarters. Newspaper editors have, no doubt, reached the point of mistakenly equating the "Administration" with the "University" simply because the greatest part of their university copy has, over the years, been supplied by that part of the university. They are quite unprepared to accept as a legitimate explanation of events a faculty association or a student council account in the absence of the "official" version. As the policy of silence produced nothing substantial in the way of Administration press releases, the newspapers gave no support to the faculty and students for (in the November 22 opinion of the *Star-Phoenix*) "Dr. J. W. T. Spinks . . . and the chairman of the board of governors have *voiced* little concern [over this matter]." (Italics added.)

Education of the general public with respect to the role, purpose and nature of the university became almost impossible in such a situation. What needed to be done, in this particular instance, was not done. The public had to be told clearly and forcefully, and as soon after the Premier's October 18 speech as possible, that there *is* a fundamental difference in principle between control of the total amount of the budget by the government and detailed control by the legislature of the

complete university budget. Such a statement issued at an early opportunity by the Board, even if others were not forthcoming, would have helped considerably in clarifying the issues.

The issues, arguments, and developments of the day made it appear that the government was on one side of the fence and the university on the other. Yet was that really an accurate assessment? Was it not rather that the government and Board-Administration were on one side (settling the dispute, as they saw it, according to ground rules on which they agreed), and the faculty-students on the other side, articulating their feelings and fears in a way quite unacceptable to the other participants in the dispute, that is by way of the communications media? Was it not that the lines of division between the various combatants were drawn according to the frameworks within which the respective groups and individuals operated and the constituents to whom they ultimately held themselves accountable? Ministers of the government could attack verbally members of the faculty because the faculty chose to present their case to the public via the communications media. But by the same token government ministers were in no position to criticize publicly the President, the Chancellor, or the Board of Governors, for the Board-Administration chose to deal with the government on non-public terms.

No matter which way they turned, the faculty and students felt they were losers, publicly. The government was attacking them; the Board was not supporting them. Within a few days following the presentation of the budget to the Legislature, the President delivered his annual "State of the University" address. A section of that speech sub-titled "All's Well that Ends Well" included a statement interpreted by the faculty as a criticism of the role the faculty and students chose to play and the public campaign they waged during the dispute. "Nobody stands to gain by public discussion of these matters [university financing] except the news media," the President stated. He continued: "All parts of the University should be united in their desire to see a strong University . . . With the loyal support of all segments of the University family, the Board can . . . express the views of the University in the strongest possible manner. It greatly weakens the effect if all and sundry express their views, often based on a quite incomplete knowledge of the facts, in an uncoordinated manner." Clearly, what the faculty and student body had learned by the end of March was that they could be used as common whipping boys by both government and Board-Administration.

With the publication of the provincial budget on March 1 it became obvious that the university would not "be obliged to make its financial requests to the Legislature in the same manner as any other spending department." The university budget was presented in greater detail than had previously been the case (a breakdown of seven categories for each of the two campuses as well as for general administration replaced the previous lump-sum dual categorization of Operation and Construction for the university as a whole),<sup>4</sup> but only one legislative vote was taken on the total university grant. Professor Naylor's reaction, that he was "glad to see the government has reconsidered its original intentions," was shared by his colleagues. The immediate crisis had been solved and not, apparently, to the disadvantage of the university, as had originally been feared.

Was that, however, an entirely satisfactory conclusion to draw at the end of the dispute? Was the university as autonomous going out of the dispute as it had been going in? Whereas the government appeared to have reconsidered its original intentions, and whereas the university appeared to have succeeded in getting its point across that budgetary specifics must remain in university hands, the government may have accomplished by intimidation what it had failed to accomplish by legislation. The fact that the seven-category breakdown is now in existence as public information makes it possible for the government to bring to the university's attention (and to criticize implicitly) in an entirely new way over-expenditures in one area and under-expenditures in another. Whether in fact such a development will come about will not be known until the new system has been tried for two or three years. Certainly the university cannot be placed in the position of appearing to act in bad faith, for mutual government-university respect would then be lost. It is entirely conceivable that the university in preparing its budgetary estimates will now be more likely to tailor its requests to the known and anticipated prejudices of the government. If such a development takes place, then the government would have succeeded in realizing an important objective simply by instilling a sense of nervousness into the university. Quiet diplomacy may well have helped to win the battle, but it may also have helped to lose the war. For the danger in quiet diplomacy (and a very real danger at that) is that the university may have lost its independence by giving up its independent will. To retain its

<sup>4</sup> The seven items listed under the "Operation" section of the budget were: permanent salaries and pensions; other salaries; materials and supplies; travel; furniture and equipment; scientific equipment; and other expenses.

independent will the university must *seem to do so*, and quiet diplomacy is no way to do that.

Following the presentation of the budget President Spinks commented that "all winter long they [the provincial government] have been saying they would not interfere with academic freedom and they did not." The fact that the government did not appear to interfere internally in the operations of the university would seem to indicate that the Board-Administration "quiet diplomacy" policy had succeeded. Yet surely, if quiet diplomacy worked in this particular situation it did so only because of the concomitant success of the faculty-student tactic of presenting the university's case to the public. It cannot be denied that the Board's bargaining position *vis-à-vis* the government was *strengthened substantially* (not weakened) by the public discussion of the issue generated as a result of the role the faculty-students chose to play. To illustrate, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, holding its annual meeting during the height of the controversy, pledged \$525,000. to the University's Building Campaign "provided . . . the Board of Directors [of the Wheat Pool] can assure the membership that traditional academic freedom is being observed." Delegates were quoted in the press as saying they would only support an academic institution "that runs its own affairs" and they expressed "deep concern . . . as a result of the Premier's announcement — concern that cuts across party lines." This sort of comment, coming from one of the most influential groups in the province, was of the type the Premier could comprehend. Private sources of financial support for the university might vanish (leaving the government in an embarrassing position in relation to the university for an important source of university income could conceivably disappear), and party support might be threatened. Such a gloomy prospect was presented to the Premier not as a result of quiet diplomacy, but rather as a significant by-product of public discussion of the issue resulting directly from the action adopted by the professors and their students. The Wheat Pool resolution (and other public manifestations of concern) would, in all likelihood, never have come about had it not been for the pressures exerted on the public by the otherwise overlooked part of the university.

Quiet diplomacy became a viable and productive course of action *because of* open, frank discussion with the public by faculty and students. Making that policy viable, however, proved to be costly, for viability came at the expense of finding satisfactory answers to two fundamental questions: "Who speaks for the modern University?" and "What channels

of communication exist *within* the university for exchange of opinions, consultation, and formulation of policy by faculty, students, and administration?" Surely the Saskatchewan experience of 1967-68 presented conclusive evidence of the fact that the faculty and students acted with responsibility; restraint, and honesty in doing what a university must do if it is to remain true to itself, denying, as a result, any truth to the argument that these constituent parts of the university should not, as a minimum, be consulted in and become a party to the decision-making process. The modern university is ill-equipped to deal with politicians and governments. It needs all the help it can enlist on its side. It cannot afford the dubious luxury of being divided when external threats are made to its very existence.

John C. COURTNEY,  
University of Saskatchewan  
(Saskatoon).

## WITHIN OR WITHOUT ?

### The Location of the Faculty Association

W. B. Cunningham \*

I have recently re-read the "Report on Simon Fraser University" by the C.A.U.T. Special Investigating Committee.<sup>1</sup> Twice in this *Report* the committee members expressed their view about the desired relationship of a faculty association to the formal structure of university government. Since I propose to challenge this view let me first quote the relevant passages.

We conceive the job of a faculty association to be twofold. Its primary purpose is to promote the well-being of the university community. A subsidiary purpose is to protect the welfare of its members . . . But a faculty association, as such, should not engage directly in university government. Rather, in this area, it acts as ombudsman, to identify and rectify instances of maladministration, and to participate forcefully in every attempt to improve administration. (p. 6)

Towards the end of the *Report* the committee members repeated these ideas.

We agree with the President [of Simon Fraser] that a well-developed Faculty Association is essential, but we do not share any possible concern he may have that it is "outside the corporate structure of the University." It is rightly outside the corporate structure and we sincerely hope that it will remain so. We look upon the Faculty Association as playing the role of ombudsman, keeping its eye on government within the corporate structure, ever alert to see that academic freedom is maintained in this "place of liberty", and pressing constantly for the highest and best that is attainable in the university community. (p. 23)

These two paragraphs are a minor part of a good report. It was not primarily concerned with the question contained in these statements and the authors, quite properly, presented no further argument in support of their strong conclusion that a faculty association is best located outside the corporate structure of a university. What bothers me is that these statements, while presented in the form of an answer, really raise a question on a matter of much significance. They raise

\* Dr. Cunningham is Joseph Lawrence Black Professor of Economics and Head of the Department at Mount Allison University.

<sup>1</sup> C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (April, 1968), pp. 4-28.

a question that I believe has not yet received the thought and analysis that its importance demands.

What is the proper location of a faculty association? Should our associations continue in their present position, one that reflects the historical conditions of their emergence in the nineteen-fifties, or should our associations be striving to obtain a formally recognized position within a corporate structure that is currently being re-examined and altered at many universities? I think the latter is preferable; clearly others think differently. This difference in view disturbs me less than does the relatively little attention so far given to the question.

In recent years the Canadian university community has focused much of its attention on the structure of university government. Our C.A.U.T. merits much credit for having successfully stimulated a widespread interest, study, and discussion on this topic. More recently students and student groups, somewhat more noisily if not more successfully, have been actively seeking reforms. Through their speeches and writings, university presidents and members of governing boards have been contributing their views to this great debate. I cannot claim to have read all that has been written about university government in Canada; nor can I claim to have made a diligent search for previously expressed views on the specific question that I have raised above. To my knowledge, however, there has been almost nothing written about the desirable location of a faculty association.

Past issues of this *Bulletin* is where one would logically expect to find an analysis of the question. In a quick examination of *Bulletins* back to December, 1961, I found about ten articles that dealt directly with university government. In only one of these did I find any direct reference to the question.

In the May, 1965, issue Professor Mayo offered some guiding principles for creating a model of university government.<sup>2</sup> Then he proceeded to sketch the outlines of a desirable model. He had this to say about faculty associations:

The role of the Faculty Association would not diminish under this model but would in fact be enhanced, and in some respects changed. E.g., it would form the body to conduct elections to the Senate, to form the committee to recommend an appointee

<sup>2</sup> Mayo, H. B. "University Government — Trends and a New Model." *C.A.U.T. Bulletin*, 13, 4 (May, 1965), pp. 10-24.

as Vice-Chancellor [the administrative head], and (perhaps) to recommend the non-permanent academic administrators (deans, e:c.); it would work out (with the Senate) all conditions of employment. It would also have a continuing role of importance in studying and recommending on any university matter whatever. (p. 23)

Clearly Professor Mayo's answer to my question is that a faculty association should exist inside, not outside, the corporate structure. Unfortunately he was sketching the outlines of a complete model that he did not think was feasible at this time. He did not apply his skilful analytical powers to a further examination of the desirability and feasibility of bringing existing faculty associations within the present corporate structures. I can only suspect that he would have found it to be both desirable and feasible.

In the December, 1961, issue of the *Bulletin*, Professor R. Cook gave a select bibliography on university government. The titles of the listed items did not encourage me to investigate their contents. I turned from the *Bulletins* to the Duff-Berdahl Report: *University Government in Canada*.

The Commissioners did not overlook the position and role of faculty associations. They could scarcely have done so since the C.A.U.T. (with the A.U.C.C.) was the sponsoring body. The Commissioners raised the question of whether faculty associations should be brought within the formal structure of the university and recommended against it. (Several faculty association had proposed to the Commission that they be given a form of constitutional standing. This is further evidence of the need for the *Bulletin* to provide an exchange of views before anyone uncritically accepts the conclusions quoted from the Simon Fraser Report.)

I do not find the four-page discussion in the Duff-Berdahl Report convincing.<sup>3</sup> It starts out by stating that the faculty association "tends to remain essentially a body of protest rather than of achievement — for the obvious reason that it has no constitutional standing within the university." By over-looking the substantial achievements of many faculty associations this is an unfair statement, but as a statement of a tendency I think it can be accepted as valid. The lack of formal recognition and acceptance makes it more difficult for an association

<sup>3</sup> Duff, Sir James and Berdahl, Robert O. *University Government in Canada*. Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 1966, pp. 61-65.

## **REMOVAL OF CENSURE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

*At its November meeting the Council of C.A.U.T. removed its censure from the President and Board of Governors of Simon Fraser University. Council had before it the report of an investigating committee that visited the University at the end of October and the results of a referendum held in early November at Simon Fraser in which faculty had voted by a majority in the ratio of 2 to 1 for removal of censure.*

*The report of the C.A.U.T. investigating committee, prepared without reference to the referendum, is as follows :*

## **REPORT ON SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

At its meeting in September, the Executive and Finance Committee, having discussed the effects of the resolution of censure against the President and Board of Simon Fraser University, decided that the Association President, the Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the Executive Secretary should "visit Simon Fraser University prior to the November Council meeting in order to assess the situation at that time." Accordingly, Professors Macpherson, Milner, and Smith spent about three and a half days at Simon Fraser (October 27-30). We met with the Executive of the Faculty Association, had separate interviews with the Acting President, the Dean of Arts, the Dean of Science, the Dean of Education, the Vice-President in charge of administration, and met either individually or in small groups with more than thirty faculty members of all ranks; we met with students and Teaching Assistants, attended a meeting of the Faculty Association and a meeting of the Student Council, and had a lengthy meeting with the Board of Governors. The discussions were frank — although we ourselves were criticized by the President of the Student Council for being "reticent" — and we are convinced that we were exposed to a good cross-section of prevalent opinion on the campus.

Much that was said indicated that there continues to be a considerable amount of unrest and dissension in the University, which ranges from such subjects as the organization of departmental structures to the function of the Registrar. In part, the members of the University community are divided along faculty/student lines — but only in part. There are also deep divisions within the ranks of both faculty and students. The unrest and concern have, however, their parallels on every campus in Canada. They appear to be deeper — or perhaps the various proponents are more vociferous — at Simon Fraser for reasons related to the youthfulness and extremely rapid growth of the institution and to various aspects of its short history, many of which were described in the report of the Investigating Committee that visited the university last January.

The present Committee had, however, to direct its attention specifically to matters related to the censure. We noted that, with one or two exceptions, there was general agreement that the effect of the censure had been to bring about improvement in the administration of the University, through the resignation of the previous President and the appointment of an Acting President for whose personal, academic, and administrative gifts there was clearly great general respect. It was agreed also that the Board of Governors had given considerable evidence of having understood what the censure was meant to convey. Nonetheless, in some quarters there were doubts — of varying intensity — as to whether the Board might not be intending simply to lie low in the hope that the censure would be lifted quickly, and then to resume the modes of action that had helped to precipitate the resolution of censure.

The resolution was of course directed specifically at the President and the Board. The former having left the scene, we had to consider the actions and position of the Board. In June the Board had published a statement in which it had committed itself to the following propositions :

“We have considered in depth the ramifications of the existing fragmentation and we unanimously agree that

1 : the Board is deeply concerned with the C.A.U.T. motion of censure and assures the university community and the community at large of its earnest desire to co-operate with the faculty in expediting measures to bring about the lifting of the censure motion.

2(a) : The Board reaffirms its desire to have an early opportunity for considering and approving a document acceptable to the faculty that sets out policies on academic freedom and tenure.

2(b) : The Board confirms its agreement to accept either on an interim or permanent basis the U.B.C. or C.A.U.T. statement of academic freedom and tenure.

3 : The Board agrees that it will not take unilateral action in changing recommendations from the President on academic matters such as appointments, renewals and tenure.

4 : The Board encourages the University Senate to make available to the Board as soon as possible their recommendations on methods of appointment, tenure and functions of Deans and Heads of departments.

5 : The Board recognize the need to re-examine the Universities Act in the light of changing conditions and will ask the Temporary Acting or Acting President to urge upon the Minister of Education the pressing need for wide and extended consultation with all interested parties, including faculty and students, before amendments to the Act are introduced.

6 : The Board agrees to accept a new recommendation from the Acting President on the renewal of the contract of Dr. Kenneth R. Burstein, Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology."

Since announcing these commitments, the Board has in fact approved a document on academic freedom and tenure that was prepared by the faculty association, and has carried out its promises as regards the fourth and sixth of these commitments. There remain points three and five, and the discussions that we had with the Board centred on these. As regards Point 5 the Board was asked whether it had taken the action prescribed, and acknowledged that it had not yet done so. It undertook to do so.

The most difficult problem — Point 3 — remained. It is the most difficult because of the problems of definition involved in it : (a) What in fact constitutes "unilateral action in changing a recommendation," and (b) Can "academic matters such as appointments, renewals, and tenure" be clearly defined ?

In regard to (a), one may ask (i) whether simple refusal of a recommendation constitutes "unilateral action in changing a recommendation," and (ii) whether referral back for further consideration, once, or more than once, constitutes such action. We discussed this problem with the Board at length, emphasizing that it is normal practice in Canadian universities that the Board accepts recommendations of the President on academic matters.

In regard to (b), we found some difficulty in seeing how a clear interpretation could be given to the phrase "academic matters" beyond the obvious content of appointments, tenure, and promotions. After further reflection and discussion, we take the view that it would be unwise to attempt to define the outer limits of "academic matters" specifically and that any future action that might appear to constitute a breach of the intent of the commitment should be dealt with as it occurs.

We regretted that at our meeting with the Board neither the immediate past Chairman nor the Acting Chairman was present. Nevertheless the discussions were very frank and effective, and we feel that the understanding arrived at as to the appropriate role of the Board under the present Universities Act was sufficiently clear to prevent a recurrence of such actions as those that led to the censure. A recurrence would, in the ordinary course of events, come to the attention of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

We are fully conscious of the multitude of difficult problems that remain to be dealt with at Simon Fraser University. We are convinced that these problems are now essentially internal and can only be resolved through the efforts of faculty, students, and administrators within the University. We take the view that the resolution of censure has served its purpose, in that it induced an energetic attack on the problems of university government and ensured that the role of the Board was reduced to its appropriate limits, or something near them.

We therefore recommend that the censure now be lifted.

C. B. MACPHERSON, Chairman

J. B. MILNER

J. P. SMITH

November 13, 1968.

to become a body of achievement. The attitude of the members of an association is not independent of the attitude of the official university officers and governing bodies to it. Students of industrial relations are well aware of this type of reciprocal influence. To leave the faculty association outside the formal structure is to say that the association is of marginal importance and significance to the university, a body that can be consulted if convenient and otherwise largely neglected except to the extent that it can exert pressures that would be politically inexpedient for the official bodies to ignore. I think that any association in such a position, which is the presently-existing one for most associations, will always have a tendency to be, or at least appear to be, primarily a body of protest. The commissioners do not recommend this explicitly but the effect of their recommendation supported by their own logic, leads to this conclusion.

Other statements from this part of the *Report* add force to my conclusion. "The fundamental concerns of staff associations with salary, tenure, and conditions of service are not at all affected by the reforms we propose. It seems clear that the Faculty Associations could pursue these goals more vigorously if they stayed completely outside the formal structure of university government." The faculty associations can "prosper more without this compromising connection with university government." These statements sound to me like a clarion call for straight trade union action. Let others worry about the complexities and responsibilities of budgets, buildings, and bank loans. Stay outside the constitutional fold, remaining free to press vigorously for economic benefits in the self-interest of the association members. Perhaps this is the best role for an association. If it is then we should be honest about it, discarding our past deceptions, including self-deceptions. We should refrain from stating that the principal purpose of a faculty association "is to promote the well-being of the university community. A subsidiary purpose is to protect the welfare of its members."

The Duff-Berdahl analysis follows the conventional wisdom in its attitude to junior faculty members. It is common to look upon this group as a potential source of trouble, discontent and unrest, because they are inexperienced, irresponsible, and unwise. This seems to be one of the permanent university myths, sustained by occasional youthful indiscretions but overwhelmingly refuted by the weight of empirical evidence available to any close observer of faculty behaviour.

The commissioners, of course, do not express themselves so bluntly: "power cannot be shared until the shared power can be wisely used, and the newer faculty may lack the experience to use this power wisely." From this they develop a second role for faculty associations. They "are attractive arenas in which junior staff can voice their ideas." If universities institute the other changes in structure that the commissioners propose "...in these more relaxed conditions, the Faculty Association will play its natural role of increasing the attachment of the junior staff to the university." In short, junior staff members who have an interest in the way their university is run need a forum for their critical comments. The commissioners think that faculty associations can usefully provide this safety-valve service, harmlessly releasing the pent-up steam of youthful radicals pressing for change.

I wonder if the commissioners gave sufficient thought to their proposal and its probable effects. Consider some of the other statements in this section of their report. They found a "thinly veiled mutual hostility" between associations and official bodies "present at too many universities." They asked "Presidents and Boards not to underestimate the ability of the faculty to respond with tact and wisdom to invitations to share power." "The gulf between faculty and administration needs to be bridged rather than widened", and thus associations should not exclude administrators from membership. Presidents and Boards should "try to view their Faculty Associations as potential allies rather than as inveterate opponents." The faculty association "is a *local* body with *local* roots and with aspirations to enhance the *local university*."

What logic links these statements to the recommendation that associations should remain in limbo—the abode of souls barred from heaven through no fault of their own? Is a faculty association that is expected to "pursue vigorously" its "fundamental concerns" with salaries and conditions of service; to provide a forum for the intemperate demands of the young; and to have no formally recognized existence within the university community—is such a body likely to diminish the thinly veiled mutual hostility, to bridge the gulf between faculty and administration, and to be looked upon as a potential ally? The commissioners stated that "there is nothing in our proposals to inhibit the continued pursuit" of the broader values of higher education by local associations, as they have done in the past. This negative justification for their recommendation prompts me to ask: does their recommendation encourage local associations to pursue the well-being of the

university community? I accept the commissioners' earlier statement that an association with no constitutional standing will tend to remain a body of protest. If such an association pursues more than the self-interest of its members it is a credit to the members but it is not a result that in any way flows from or is assisted by such a constitutional structure.

The Duff-Berdahl *Report* gave three reasons for the recommendation. One of these I have already covered. The other two require further comment at some length.

1. "First, we think it unwise to introduce additional bodies into the formal structure of the university unless existing organs are incapable of meeting the needs." Senates, reformed as proposed in the *Report*, would meet the requirement of faculty participation in university government. "For the Faculty Association to play this role would result in emptying the Senate of the substance of many of its powers."

In this paragraph the commissioners had in mind two things: one, that giving an association an official status would be introducing an additional body; second, that this body must necessarily diminish the role of the proposed Senate. Neither of these two things necessarily follows.

There is a curious omission in the Duff-Berdahl *Report*. There is no chapter or part of a chapter devoted to an examination of the body that exists, officially in some universities, in others unofficially, as a collectivity well-known to everyone: "the faculty". This term wears a many-coloured coat, sometimes meaning the teachers in a specific school or division, sometimes meaning a faculty council, and often meaning all the teaching staff in a university including perhaps (it is not always clear) an assistant line-coach of the football team.

The *Report* recommends "that the majority of the Senate should be elected by the faculty from the faculty...." (p. 29) This is followed by several suggestions about the details of the election. The way these are handled at a small university will necessarily differ from that at a large one. But somehow provision must be made for meetings, nominations and votes. There has to be organized activity by a body called "the faculty". If "the faculty" has the power to elect the majority of members to a powerful Senate then "the faculty" pre-

sumably has in some sense an official status. It exists within, not without, the corporate structure.

Who directs and guides this organized activity? Should this official body called "the faculty" not have its own executive officers, elected at regular intervals by the membership? If this official body does not possess its own executive, who determines when and how often "the faculty" will meet? Who prepares the items and their priority on an agenda? Who has the confidence of and the responsibility to the faculty" to be able to say that any decision or expression of a view is one that has the support of "the faculty"?

The Duff-Berdahl *Report* in effect recommends that the faculty be an official body possessing the power to elect a majority of the Senate. Further details are left to be worked out by each university. I submit that there are many other matters of general concern to all members of "the faculty", including the general well-being of the university community, that require some kind of formal faculty organization run by the membership. I see no reason why this should not be the formally recognized role of the faculty association. At present there exists "the faculty" and the association. Combining the two would not introduce "additional bodies into the formal structure."

And there is no reason why such a body should pre-empt the functions of the Senate. Faculty associations have done this in the past, "often of necessity" according to Duff-Berdahl, but they did so out of concern for university affairs not as a pure play for power. Hopefully, the commissioners' recommended changes for the Senate, when instituted, will relieve the necessity in the future. Should it arise again, however, surely it is far better that any corrective action required arise from a body that has an official status within, rather than an unofficial one without, the corporate structure.

2. "The Senate is also to be preferred because it embraces, by the representative principle, the entire tenured staff whereas the Faculty Association, as a voluntary society whose members pay a subscription, may or may not achieve a similar representative level."

This is the second reason given for leaving faculty associations outside the official family. It again assumes that, if brought inside, the association's responsibilities would have to dilute those of the Senate. I have dealt with this above. The commissioners also assume that a faculty association must necessarily remain a voluntary society.

At this point I approach a question that is guaranteed to raise strong emotions, not only among university administrators but also among many faculty members. Being members of a university community, however, they have trained themselves to analyze questions dispassionately, to recognize their emotional predilections, personal prejudices, and social biases and to set these to one side to avoid fallacious conclusions unsupported by logic and evidence. I think that a faculty association should have an official corporate status within the university, and that the university should require all persons when appointed to the faculty to become members of the association.

There is a stronger argument for this type of provision in university appointments than in the world of industry, unless you look upon a faculty association as a labour union. This is the crux of the matter. Is a faculty association to be primarily a trade union type of organization? Or is it going to be something different and, like universities themselves, somewhat unique?

To university administrators and governors I say this: if you want the association to be and act like a trade union, then treat it as such. Accept the Duff-Berdahl recommendation and keep the association outside the corporate structure, hoping perhaps that it will collapse or struggle along with too small a membership to be effective; recognizing and dealing with it when, despite its unofficial existence, to do otherwise would be dangerous to the good of the university. Do not permit your business office to deduct association dues from salary cheques even if individual members should authorize it. You will not likely see the associations disappear, since they have already shown their survival powers under such conditions. You may help to maintain the "thinly veiled hostility", but universities also have great survival powers. You can then live with a clear conscience knowing that you are protecting the university from being unduly contaminated through close contact with this strange organization, and comforted by the knowledge that even some faculty members agree with your approach.

To faculty members, fortunately not very numerous, who look upon the association as a trade union and who think such a group should have no place in the hearts of true academics, continue to do what you have done in the past. Do not join it. Ridicule its activities. Value the twenty dollars you have not had to pay in annual dues—it will buy about four packages of cigarettes a month. Accept any of

the university decisions that affect you favourably regardless of whether they were the end result of an initial impetus from the association. Unfortunately for your beliefs the association is likely to survive your minority view. Your actions may be a source of some discord among the faculty but you have been true to your convictions and at ease with yourself.

To faculty members, number unknown, who think the primary role of a faculty association is to protect and promote the self-interest of its members from a sometimes arbitrary and not always wise employer, accept the Duff-Berdahl recommendation. Keep the association outside the official structure of university government. Keep the association free from any of the entanglements and responsibilities of official decision-making. Keep the association strong through active recruiting of members. This is most successful when you can persuade new faculty appointees that it is only by joining with their fellows to exert pressure continuously on "the administration" that economic benefits and working conditions can be maintained and improved. To have sufficient power to be effective as a trade union requires a good percentage of the faculty as members. Convince them that you can deliver the results that they want. If the association has difficulty in arranging meetings with administrators to discuss salaries, consider the possibility of applying to the provincial labour relations board for certification. Conciliation officers from the department of labour will quickly explain to your employer his legal obligation to meet with your chosen representatives, and the penalties for refusing. Do not be anxious to engage in a concerted with-holding of services, but do not rule out such tactics. Seek a union shop but do not be surprised at the strength of the resistance to such an idea. There is no point in being a weak union, so do everything to become strong.

Faculty associations have always performed some union-type functions. If their past concern and commitment to higher values is now going to become redundant because of better-functioning Senates what remains for faculty associations at the local level? Do they disappear or do they become primarily trade unions in fact if not in name? My presentation above may appear exaggerated, but we have the Simon Fraser Report to remind us of possibilities. "Three of them represented the 'Union', a recently organized group of Faculty members who have said that they would consider asking for certification . . . under the

British Columbia Labour Act."<sup>4</sup> Is this the direction that universities and faculty members wish their associations to follow?

I do not want it. Neither do I want faculty associations to disappear. I think they can continue to make positive contributions to the general welfare of universities. I think the associations will be able to do this better, and will be more likely to do so, if they possess an official status within the university community. This brings me back to the question raised earlier, that of requiring all faculty members to join the association.

I assume that universities will continue to have a collectivity composed of faculty members that is officially recognized as the appropriate body for doing certain things. At present it is called "the faculty". When a university appoints a faculty member he automatically becomes a member of this collectivity. It is a condition of employment that cannot be avoided. A university normally hopes that each new member will be interested in the well-being of the university, serve on faculty committees, attend meetings when called, vote on matters when presented and in general act as a responsible citizen in his academic community. Some do not live up to such expectations and the university does not usually compel any members to do so. His membership depends solely upon his employment.<sup>5</sup>

This compulsory membership in "the faculty" does not carry with it the compulsory payment of membership dues. But this is a rather trivial matter that does not greatly bother anyone when the university compels all appointees to make other types of payments. It is common practice, for example, to require all appointees to contribute to a pension plan. Such requirement, it is thought, benefits the university, not just the individual. Thus, in principle, there can be no objection to the compulsory levy of dues for membership in "the faculty", if it is thought that membership is beneficial to the university.

My proposal is that "the faculty" become the faculty association. Preferably membership in it should be automatically a result of appointment to the university, with payment of membership dues required, and administered through payroll deductions. I think the association

<sup>4</sup> C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (April, 1968), p. 11. In this same issue see p. 70 for a brief reference to some recent events in the United States.

<sup>5</sup> Note that the extent to which a member of "the faculty" participates in its affairs may have some influence on decisions about his tenure, salary, and promotions. There are some pressures to perform as expected, and possible penalties for not doing so.

could be a useful part of the formal structure without making membership or financial support compulsory. But since these two forms of compulsion do not differ much from present practice, and yield obvious advantages (membership is representative of those engaged as faculty, dispelling of "thinly veiled hostility", etc.) I see no reason why these requirements should not be instituted.

If there is any strong objection to forcing faculty members to pay dues there is an easy solution. The university could itself pay the appropriate sum to the association. A radical proposal? Only if one still views the association as a trade union. My objective is to minimize the likelihood of faculty associations losing their concern for higher values, and adopting some modern version of Gomperism. Universities expect to pay the costs of operating the other parts of the official structure of government.

It may be objected that the major portion of the dues would leave the local association for the operation of C.A.U.T. Is this anything much different from what universities presently do? Does the university not pay for the costs of A.U.C.C.? How many universities pay the annual membership dues for their business managers, and registrars, to belong to their national organizations? Does the operation of C.A.U.T. not benefit the universities? Our presidents have been distinguished scholars who have devoted enormous amounts of time and energy to leading C.A.U.T. effectively in the interests of universities. They did not chart a trade union course for the C.A.U.T. If local associations do not become trade unions then their national association will not do so. I see nothing illogical about direct university financial support for local associations or for their national body. I am not proposing that this approach be adopted. It is merely an example of another matter on which there has been little thought or debate.

Local associations can exist now without being affiliated with C.A.U.T. My proposal that local associations should become officially "the faculty" would not change this. Affiliation would be a matter, as always, for majority decision of the membership. No faculty member who was forced to become a member of the local association would be forced to become a member of C.A.U.T. He would only be forced to abide by the majority decision of the local group. Our common acceptance of democratic principles suggests that this is not an onerous type of compulsion.

What would happen if a local association, with compulsory membership, decided to expel a member? Would the university have to end his appointment? Such questions again reflect the tendency to view faculty associations as trade unions. There may have been an expulsion of a member from a local association, but I have never heard of one. I would be surprised if the constitution of any association contained any provision for expulsion. Would universities and faculty members need a "right-to-work" provision to avoid some possible individual injustice? I do not think so. In any event if faculty associations do not view themselves as trade unions they should have no objection to a provision that prevented the association from expelling a member. Membership would simply begin and end when the university made and terminated an appointment.

I now return to where I began this essay: the views expressed by the authors of the Simon Fraser *Report*. How can a faculty association assume and perform the role of an ombudsman? Suppose there is a dispute concerning academic freedom leading to a university decision that directly affects the person who is currently serving as president of the local association. Can the local association be an impartial, disinterested body that undertakes an investigation to prevent individual injustice? More importantly, can a university be expected to accept the intervention of a self-appointed investigating body that possesses no official status in the community, as one that can or should serve as an ombudsman in a dispute revolving around one of the members of that voluntary local body? Can an association of civil servants replace the recently appointed ombudsman in New Brunswick? I think the ombudsman analogy is worthless and I respectfully suggest that the authors of the *Report* are mistaken on this point.

We are fortunate that universities have been moving so slowly in adopting the Duff-Berdahl proposals. There is still some time for faculty associations and C.A.U.T. to determine what they wish to become and where they best fit within or without the formal university structure. If the best place is within, the best time to move there is when a university is acting on the Duff-Berdahl *Report*. That time is getting short.

W. B. CUNNINGHAM,  
Mount Allison University.

# CONSULTATION AND PARTICIPATION: A REPORT ON THE ONTARIO COLLEGE OF ART

Edward J. Monahan

Readers of the *Bulletin* will recall the troubles which wracked the Ontario College of Art last year and finally produced direct intervention by the Minister of Education of the province.<sup>1</sup> At the time the Minister promised an appropriate investigation of the College would be carried out. Shortly afterwards, in March, Dr. Douglas T. Wright, Chairman of the Ontario Advisory Committee on University Affairs, was appointed to conduct a study "of the present legislation and structure governing the operation and administration of the Ontario College of Art with the objective of bringing such matters into line with present-day needs".

Dr. Wright has now published his *Report* and it is a significant one, not only for the Ontario College of Art but also for other institutions of post-secondary education in Ontario and elsewhere in Canada.

The *Report* wisely avoids reference to the previous troubles, declaring simply that it was not the purpose of the investigation to engage in any detailed examination of the unseemly events of last February. Readers, however, may surmise that a great deal lies hidden behind the obvious understatement that these troubles were largely due to "an obsolete and faulty pattern of government and administration". The unique situation of the College, the only institution of its kind in the province, had left it isolated, apparently unaware of and certainly unaffected by the important changes in the power structures and patterns of organization of other post-secondary institutions in the province and elsewhere. Times were changing radically but the Ontario College of Art was not moving with them.

The Wright *Report* undertakes to remedy this situation and, if its major recommendations are accepted and implemented, the situation is likely to be markedly improved. In the words of the *Report*, the keynote of the present practises in post-secondary institutions is "consultation and participation in decision-making" involving all interested parties — public, administration, faculty, and students : the recommendations of the *Report* are calculated to introduce these practises to the Ontario College of Art.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Smith. "University-Government Relations : A Case in Point," *C.A.U.T. Bulletin*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (April, 1968), 78-81.

The *Report* borrows heavily from the Duff-Berdahl report on *University Government in Canada*, which it acknowledges as providing "far and away the most effective focussing on these issues". But Dr. Wright moves beyond Duff-Berdahl on the key issue of student participation and rejects the D-B preference for the "two-tier" structure of internal government in favour of what the *Report* terms an unicameral ("single-tier") system.

## Student Participation

The *Report* presents one of the more succinct and compelling arguments yet published for student participation in institutional government. Though stated in a carefully modulated double negative form — "there is no essential reason why students in post-secondary institutions should not participate fully in decision-making" — the argument is nevertheless very persuasive. Students in universities and colleges are adults and future leaders of society; they have a genuine interest in the governance of the institutions of which they are members; and they have an important contribution to make. Moreover, their participation in government in turn will contribute to their education and maturation.

Though his specific recommendations on student participation will not satisfy those who insist that students should hold half (or more) of the seats on committees, senate, and board, Dr. Wright rejects token representation and insists on meaningful participation by students at all levels of the institution's governing structure.

## The Council

The *Report* proposes that the College be governed by a Council comprised of nineteen members, including the President of the College: nine members to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, six members to be elected by the full-time academic staff, and three members to be elected from among the full-time students. Government and faculty representatives will serve staggered three-year terms; students will elect their representatives annually to one and two-year terms, with provision that a student may serve on Council for a maximum of three years. Other members of Council are eligible for re-election or re-appointment.

To show that the Council is meant to be taken seriously, Dr. Wright recommends it be given the duty to declare vacant the seat of any member who fails to attend fifty percent of the meetings in any fiscal year, the vacancy to be filled in the same way in which the

unseated member was selected. To insure the maintenance of balance between appointed and elected members of Council, it is further recommended that the quorum be eight, including not less than four appointed and four elected members.

In another healthy departure from tradition, the Wright *Report* comes out strongly in favour of "openness" in the conduct of institutional affairs. It recommends that the minutes of Council meetings, and other minutes, be made fully available to all interested parties, including staff and students, "excepting only references to matters affecting individuals which may be prejudicial to their own interests, and excepting matters where confidentiality is required for business affairs." The *Report* also frowns on the practice of treating as confidential general budgets and statements of institutional income and expenditure. These recommendations are not likely to satisfy the most fervent disciples of "open decision-making" but if implemented they will go a considerable way towards rationalizing institutional processes of consultation and participation.

### Divisional Academic Boards

In keeping with the basic proposal to decentralize the governance of the institution, the *Report* recommends the establishment of a divisional academic board for each of the divisions (corresponding roughly to faculties) in the College, with appropriate departmental structures in the two divisions (Fine Arts and Applied Arts) large enough to warrant them. The proposed divisional boards would comprise the members of the teaching staff in the division (all who teach two periods or more) plus ten members elected from and by the students enrolled in the programmes of the division, with the director of the division serving as chairman. Under the general supervision of the Council each divisional academic board would be able "to make rules and regulations for the government, direction and management of the division", including the fixing of courses of study, and the determination of examinations and grades.

### Administrative Offices

Adopting the same approach as Duff-Berdahl in dealing with the office of President, the *Report* urges that his role be more clearly defined while at the same time the pressures on the office be relieved. When a new President is to be chosen Dr. Wright favours recommendation by a sub-committee of Council, with balanced representation from internal

and external members. (The present chief executive officer, who held office during the "troubles", has indicated that he is confident he can work within the "new order" proposed in the *Report* and presumably will stay on.)

On the matter of limited terms, the *Report* almost takes a firm step forward with the conclusion that "other things being equal from the point of view of the institution there is undoubtedly advantage in a fixed term appointment." Since, however, other things might not be equal and an otherwise first-class candidate might be unwilling to accept a limited term, the logic is not pressed. With respect to appointments for divisional directors and department heads, however, the recommendation is for three-year terms with eligibility for reappointment, but only under the same procedures as govern the initial appointment — appointment by Council upon the advice of the President, obtained through a nominating committee consisting of four or five persons, roughly half of whom are elected from within the division or department concerned and half appointed by Council from other parts of the College.

### Academic Appointments

One section of the *Report* deals specifically with matters of academic appointments, 'til now a singularly depressed and depressing area of life in the College. With remarkable restraint Dr. Wright points out that present procedures for making faculty appointments, which are on a year-to-year basis, with salary on a "piece-work" basis depending on the number of periods taught, are "obviously out of phase with the balance of the educational world." He recommends that both full-time and part-time (he calls them "fractional") appointments be made for successive periods of one, two, and three years, with full-time faculty becoming eligible for tenure after serving a six-year probationary period. He also recommends the establishment of a basis for "full-time" appointments related to a minimum teaching load (six periods being the suggested minimum).

Although the length of the proposed probationary period — six years — is excessive, the *Report* quite properly emphasizes that the granting of tenure should be regarded as a matter for most careful consideration. Details to be involved in this consideration are not spelled out, but the *Report* does recommend that tenured appointments, apart from reasons of retirement or extraordinary financial

exigencies, should be terminated only for "adequate cause", and then only after following procedures "more or less in the style advocated in the document of the Canadian Association of University Teachers dealing with tenure."

Probationers whose term appointments are not renewed do not receive the same benefit of the relevant section in the C.A.U.T. *Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure*. As Dr. Wright puts it, "While the College may wish to indicate the reason for non-reappointment after a probationary period, it should not be mandatory that reason be given." One may well ask, if it's not mandatory, what likelihood is there that any reason will ever be given?

### Student Rights and Freedoms

In still another refreshing departure from the traditional, this *Report* has something both intelligent and practical to say about the rights and privileges of students. Recognizing the heightened concern currently being expressed about these matters and the effective demise of the principle of *in loco parentis*, the *Report* urges the development by the College of a statement of policy and procedures involving student rights and freedoms and due process in cases of disciplinary action. Again, what is to be included in such a statement is not detailed but at least a beginning is made by reference to the contents of the Carrothers Report and the Joint Statement recently developed in the U.S.<sup>2</sup>

The *Report* aims at providing the Ontario College of Art with structures to make possible debates and deliberations in forums with effective authority for resolving differences by means of reasonable processes. I think it succeeds in very large measure and if its major recommendations are implemented a satisfactory structure will be established. The Minister has already promised that legislation dealing with O.C.A. will be introduced at the next session of the legislature and it seems likely that these necessary reforms will be enacted.

However, as the *Report* itself points out, "no structure or pattern will work effectively without a genuine effort on the part of all concerned". Because of this, optimism concerning the likelihood of effective reform must be tempered by sober recognition of the fact that the

<sup>2</sup> *Report of the President's Committee of Inquiry into Social Behaviour*, A. W. R. Carrothers, Chairman, London, University of Western Ontario, March, 1968. *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students*. C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (December, 1967), pp. 58-67.

same persons who held administrative responsibilities during the "ancien regime" will be the ones charged with the task of implementing both the spirit and the letter of the "new order". Although this task will be far from easy, one can earnestly hope that it will be successful.

In conclusion I would like to return to a consideration of the unicameral system of government proposed by Dr. Wright and to the arguments used by him to justify his preference for this system over the more traditional bicameral system. Admittedly, the "two-tier" system requires machinery for the necessary liaison between board and senate; but this need not (as the *Report* implies) be a source of delay or a factor engendering difficult negotiations. The crucial problem to be solved is that of getting the various segments of the academic community working effectively together. This is an "educational" problem; but once resolved the difficulties of negotiating the inevitable compromises should be capable of being reduced to manageable proportions irrespective of the structure through which they are reached.

Of course it is imperative today, if indeed it ever was otherwise, "to give consideration simultaneously to academic and fiscal affairs in the highest councils of an educational institution". But this is an unconvincing argument in favour of an unicameral system of government. No serious student of contemporary university government in Canada argues that fiscal and academic affairs should be kept separate. Certainly, Duff and Berdahl do not. Yet they reject the unicameral system.

Their reasons for so doing are worth noting. To them the "single-tier fused board" seems:

"to contain a risk that academic issues will take second place to the more pressing fiscal and administrative problems. In other words, in trying to do the work of both Board and Senate, the Senate functions may receive too little attention, and still more there may be too little communication between the Council in its academic role and the faculty at large."<sup>3</sup>

Such an argument ought to be weighed very carefully against Dr. Wright's contention that the present imperative need for an unicameral board dealing simultaneously with academic and fiscal affairs is a result of "the advent of such modern management techniques as

<sup>3</sup> *University Government in Canada*, Sir James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1966, p. 15.

program budgeting, with the associated notions of cost/benefit analysis and the like".

Though the arguments over the relative merits of a "one-tier" and a "two-tier" system of university government may appear to some to be a contemporary version of the mythical mediaeval problem, "How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?" the practical consequences may be considerably greater. Our universities need to become more efficient but not at the price of becoming less academic. Tensions between the demands of academic considerations and those of administrative efficiency are normal. But ways of striking the proper balance must constantly be sought.

While Dr. Wright was careful in his public statements following the release of the *Report* to emphasize that it was written for one particular institution and that no attempt should be made to apply its recommendations without qualification to other institutions, the principles embodied in the *Report* as well as the spirit behind them are a very helpful contribution to the continuing debate on the best forms of institutional government. As such they deserve our careful study.

Edward J. MONAHAN.

### DEAN OF STUDIES

Selkirk College, Castlegar, B.C., requires a Dean of Studies, with duties to commence as soon as convenient, but no later than July 1, 1969.

**DUTIES :** To supervise and co-ordinate all aspects of the instructional program, to develop new courses and programs, to articulate the College's curriculum with those of other institutions, and to advise on all matters relevant to instructional facilities.

**QUALIFICATIONS :** Applicants should possess at least a Master's degree (preferably a Ph.D.) in their chosen field of study. Preference will be given to an experienced College or University teacher or administrator.

**SALARY :** Open to negotiation.

Applications, together with full curriculum vitae, should be forwarded as soon as possible to:

The Principal,  
Selkirk College,  
Box 1200  
Castlegar, B.C.

Kodak

# Teaching aids...



## the attention-getters.

Getting your students interested, and keeping them interested, is probably one of the biggest worries you as an educator face day after day.

You can stop worrying.

Kodak's Education Markets Division has introduced a complete line of new KODAK EKTAGRAPHIC A/V products to help you provide your students with a more exciting, stimulating atmosphere to learn in.

One of the new products, the KODAK EKTAGRAPHIC 8 projector, is an inexpensive, silent, super 8 projector featuring the convenience of cartridge loading and fast, automatic rewind. The projector is small, quiet, and has a brilliant viewing screen built right into its cover,

making it ideal for individual study or small groups. In addition, the projector accepts the low-cost, convenient, super 8 cartridge, designed for safe, trouble-free handling of short lengths (8-55 ft.) of super 8 film.

Combine this with the new KODAK EKTAGRAPHIC 8 movie camera: its instant, foolproof loading; variable filming speeds; manual and power zooming; reflex viewing; and automatic, behind-the-lens exposure control, make it just right for applications such as school projects and sports.

For more information on all the new KODAK EKTAGRAPHIC A/V aids and the super 8 films available, call your Kodak A/V dealer, or write:

Canadian Kodak Co., Limited,  
Toronto 15, Ontario.



**Kodak Ektographic A/V Systems**

# A FOOTNOTE TO CONFEDERATION : WHY WAS UNIVERSITY EDUCATION MADE A PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ?

R. D. Mitchener

There is evidence to indicate that, following the pre-Confederation conference at Charlottetown in September of 1864, university education was reserved as a responsibility of the central government.<sup>1</sup> However, Resolution 43(6) of the Quebec Conference of October 1864<sup>2</sup> placed law-making powers for all education in the hands of local (i.e., provincial) legislatures.<sup>3</sup> Section 93 of the BNA follows this Quebec conference resolution in that it is generally interpreted as giving the provinces *carte blanche* with respect to legislation, if not financing, dealing with all levels of education. What happened in the one-month interval between the gatherings at Charlottetown and Quebec in so far as university education was concerned?

Reports on the deliberations at the two conferences are sketchy, especially in relation to the matter of university education. However, Whelan's description of the travels and public dinners of a group of the delegates on the trip between Charlottetown and Quebec provides one rather intriguing theme. After the dinners toasts were downed with frequency.<sup>4</sup> One cannot help but wonder if some of the delegates were aware of precisely what they were doing. Were there any sober second thoughts between Charlottetown and Quebec, or at Quebec, about giving provincial authorities legal jurisdiction over university education?

Why at Charlottetown was university education reserved for the central government? And why after Quebec wasn't it? Was one

1 *C.O. 188/141, Gordon to Cardwell, 21 September 1864.* Gordon, Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, in reporting to Cardwell, Secretary of State for the Colonies, the apportionment at Charlottetown of subjects to be dealt with by the federal and local legislatures, states: "The local legislatures are to be entrusted with the care of Education (with the exception of universities)".

2 See the report on the resolutions adopted at Quebec in Edward Whelan, *The Union of the British Provinces* (Charlottetown, 1865), p. 226.

3 *C.O. 188/141, Gordon to Cardwell, 21 November 1864:* "I am fully aware of the great difficulties attending the subject of Education, but it is with extreme regret that I see it committed to the Local Legislatures. At all events, the Universities should have been placed under the guardianship of the Central Power. The local governments, needy, rapacious, and ignorant, with little money at their disposal, are pretty certain to appropriate the University Funds to what they will call more useful objects, that is to say, objects which will enable them the (sic) scatter the money among their political adherents. My government quite admit this, and profess to lament it; but see no remedy unless means are taken to check the freedom of action of the local assembly, so far as the University of New Brunswick is concerned."

4 See Whelan's account of a banquet in Halifax, *op. cit.*, pages 18-49. Reference is made to "the usual loyal toasts", followed by several toasts to assorted persons and concepts, and finally "a few other toasts".

reason perhaps Central Canada's opposition at Quebec to a proposal which may have originated in the Maritimes?

Can anyone provide references to any documentation of any discussions on university education at either of the two conferences?

Ralph D. MITCHENER.

## What's so great about Canadian Education Showplace?

### Come and see!

Canadian Education Showplace is colourful, exciting, and informative. It's the largest, most comprehensive event of its kind in Canada. If you're interested in the latest developments and techniques in education . . . then, this is the show for you!

Here are just a few of the many special features that are waiting for you at the 1969 Showplace:

MULTI-MEDIA ENVIRONMENT FOR INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION — a fascinating look at new teaching methods presented by the OISE Adult Education and Computer Application departments • REVISED INTERVIEWS with leading educators on Ryerson's closed-circuit station CJRT • DAILY SEMINARS on New Dimensions in Education presented by the Canadian Association For Children With Learning Disabilities • An exciting view of the solar system in the 55 seat PLANETARIUM • Canada's national EXHIBITION OF SCHOOL ARCHITECTURE, a graphic display of pace-setting designs • Continuous FILMS, DISCUSSIONS, AND DEMONSTRATIONS in the CES Theatre . . .

Plus, hundreds of colourful displays, thousands of interesting new products. The very latest school supplies, equipment, and furnishings from more than 300 exhibitors.

Plan NOW to attend. For more information and FREE advance registration card, contact

Industrial and Trade Shows of Canada,  
481 University Avenue, Toronto 2, Ontario



# CANADIAN EDUCATION SHOWPLACE

Automotive Building • Exhibition Park • Toronto

JANUARY 23-25, 1969

## BOOK REVIEWS — NOTES DE LECTURE

### THE STRENGTH OF THE UNIVERSITY

by Claude T. Bissell

Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 1968.

This volume contains a selection of addresses delivered by President Claude Bissell on various occasions over the past twelve years of his tenure as president of one of Canada's major universities. They are a useful introduction to the mind and educational ideals of one who is playing a prominent part in the development of higher education in this country.

Part I, an arrangement of five pieces dealing with *Students*, gives us a clear picture of an educator who is deeply concerned with the responsibility of the university towards students, though not always in ways calculated to endear him to today's student activists. The first two were originally delivered in 1958 and 1959 as year-opening addresses to staff and students at Varsity, back in those dimly remembered days when some voices in the university, including Bissell's, were urging students to be less complacent and apathetic. Though showing their age, these brief talks nevertheless have something important to tell us about what Dr. Bissell terms "proper angularity", as distinct from bland "well-roundedness". Few of those who today classify Bissell as the essential academic establishment bureaucrat are likely to have their minds changed as a result of reading these few pages; but others may realize from reading them the inaccuracy of classifying the present Bissell posture on student power as an apt illustration of "repressive tolerance".

The opening address of the 1966-67 academic year, on *The New Radicalism*, while suffering as do most of the pieces presented here from brevity, shows a sure grasp of the meaning of this movement at a time when few members of the university community in Canada can be said to have been so alert.

The selections in Parts II and III, dealing with various aspects of the nature and purpose of the university, are to this reviewer rather more superficial and less successful. For example, the outline of the four *Characteristics of a Great University*: strong scholarship in the theoretical disciplines, strength at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, a proper balance between long and short-range institutional goals, and the presence of a real community, is too brief and incomplete to be

satisfying. Equally unsatisfying is Dr. Bissell's treatment of *The University and Moral Values*, succumbing as it does to the temptation to trim reality to fit a preconceived set of analytical categories.

To me the most interesting piece is the one written specially for this volume and from which the volume takes its title. Here President Bissell spells out the major theme of all the essays — that the university is a primary (not a derived) institution and that its primacy lies in its ability to nourish social and political ideas and to fashion the creative human person. This is a high ideal, though always open to question regarding the detailed meaning of its implications; and Bissell places himself firmly among those optimists who are confident that our Canadian universities will emerge from the present difficulties to new strength in the furtherance of this ideal.

President Bissell is a very high-minded and clear headed academic who writes with grace and lucidity. If his essays can be said to suffer from one general defect it is that which results from their author's lack of sufficient leisure necessary for mature reflection on the problems he confronts. This is a defect from which all who are charged with heavy administrative responsibilities suffer. How great Bissell's gifts are might be measured by asking rhetorically how many other presidents of Canadian universities could produce a series of essays of comparable quality ?

E. J. M.

## NOTICE OF POSITIONS VACANT \*

## ANNONCE DES POSTES VACANTS \*

*UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. Department of Theatre.* Applications are invited for the post of Assistant Professor (minimum 9500 p.a.) in the Department of Theatre. The vacancy is for a man to teach Theatre 330 (History of the Film) and Theatre 333 (Film Production) as well as to initiate and develop future film studies leading to the creation of a Department of Film. Applications with *curriculum vitae* including names and addresses of three referees should be sent to : Dr. John Brockington, Department of Theatre, University of B.C., Vancouver 8, B.C. Deadline February 1, 1969.

*UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY. Department of Economics.* It is expected that several appointments will be made, all at professorial ranks, in the Fall of 1969. Special consideration will be given to candidates in the areas of Advanced Economic Theory, Industrial Organization, Petroleum Economics. Nine-hour teaching load, competitive salaries and fringe benefits. Send *curriculum vitae* and names of three referees to Dr. H. K. Betz, Acting Head, Department of Economics, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

*Department of Mathematics.* Applications are invited for the position of Head of the Department effective 1 July, 1969. This appointment will be at the full professor level, salary open to negotiation, but not less than \$17,500. The Department has approximately 40 appointments in the professorial ranks and is involved in teaching and research in areas of pure and applied mathematics, statistics and computing science. The Department has full authority to offer the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees. The University of Calgary has 6,000 full-time students with projected increases of 20-25% per year for the next ten years. The usual fringe benefits, removal allowances, etc. apply. Enquiries should be addressed

---

\* Institutions are charged for announcements of *Positions Vacant* at the rate of 75¢ per line or fraction thereof, with a minimum of \$3 per notice. Notices should be sent to the Editor, C.A.U.T. Bulletin, 233 Gilmour Street, Suite 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario.

\* Le taux de l'annonce des postes vacants est fixé à soixantequinze cents par ligne ou fraction de ligne; le prix minimal est de trois dollars. Veuillez adresser toute annonce au directeur du *Bulletin de l'A.C.P.U.*, 233, rue Gilmour, suite 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario.

to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Calgary, Calgary 44, Alberta.

**LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY. Department of Mathematics.** Positions available from 1st September, 1969. Rank and salary to suit individual cases (from \$10,500). Field of interest, preferably, in Algebra, Analysis, Differential Equations or Applied Mathematics. Ph.D. preferred. Duties : — teaching undergraduate and graduate classes (from 1969) and Research. For further information please write to the Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario.

**KING'S COLLEGE** (affiliated University of Western Ontario). Departments of : *Economics; English; French; Political Science; Psychology; Sociology* invite applications for positions as Lecturer, Asst. or Associate Professor. *Department of English* also requires Chairman for Department at rank of Professor or Associate Professor. Applicants must have Ph.D.; appointment July or September 1969. Address inquiries to : Dr. Owen Carrigan, Principal, King's College, London, Ontario.

**UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE. Sociology Department.** Vacancies on assistant professorship level; introduction, contemporary theory, methodology, and demography preferred, but flexibility according to specialization possible; Ph.D. required; experience desirable; high salaries, 9-hour teaching load, removal expenses and other fringe benefits. September, 1969. Write to : Dr. Bernard J. Gorrow, Chairman, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.

**UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK. Department of Mathematics.** The Department of Mathematics invites applications for the following academic posts as of July 1, 1969 : Professor and/or Associate Professors; Assistants Professors; and Lecturers. Applicants should have a Ph.D. with experience and specialization in geometry and analysis. Duties will consist of teaching undergraduate and graduate courses. Salaries : Professor, \$15,200 up; Associate Professor, \$12,000 up; Assistant Professor, \$9,000 up; Lecturer, \$7,000 up; all depending on qualifications and experience. Send replies to : Professor L. P. Edwards, Head, Department of Mathematics, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick. Deadline : February 15, 1969.

**UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Department of English.** There are two openings for Associate Professors, Ph.D. required. One opening is for an

associate professor to teach honours and graduate courses in Twentieth Century English Literature, the other for an associate professor to teach Canadian Literature. Salary offered is \$12,075 and up. Group pension, medical and life insurance plans, sabbatical and study leave privileges. Assistance with travel and moving expenses will be discussed. Address inquiries to : Dr. Paul J. Marcotte, Chairman, Department of English, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario. Effective date of employment is July 1, 1969, closing date for receipt of application is January 15, 1969.

*Department of Mechanical Engineering.* Positions available in Canada's capital in different fields of Mechanical Engineering. Ph.D. degree or outstanding professional qualifications required. Salary and rank dependent upon experience. Apply : Dr. Adolph Feingold, Chairman, Mechanical Engineering Department, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario.

*ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE OF CANADA. Department of English.* Applications are invited for two openings, available September 1, 1969, in a Department which teaches a full 4-year complement of courses at both the Pass and Honours level. Men with special interests in Renaissance, 18th Century, or 19th Century English literature will be preferred. Interest in teaching English to French-speaking students would be an advantage. Applicants with the Ph.D. may be appointed as Associate or Assistant Professor; with the M.A. only, as Lecturer. The 1968-69 salary ranges are : Associate Professor, \$12,750 - \$16,350; Assistant Professor, \$9,600 - \$12,750; Lecturer, \$6,600 - \$10,200. Small classes, sick leave, sabbatical leave, medical insurance and pension plans, removal allowance. Address inquiries to R. E. Watters, Head, Department of English, Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario.

*UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN. Department of English.* Vacancies for two associate professors of English, one a specialist in American literature, one a specialist in literature of the Romantic and Victorian periods. Applicants should have the Ph.D. degree, teaching experience, some publications. Salary range, \$12,800.00 - \$16,300.00. Address inquiries to D. R. Cherry, Professor and Chairman of the Department of English, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask.

*Department of History.* Specialist in Slavic history. Appointment at any level. Salary range \$10,000 - \$17,100 (minimum for full professor) according to qualifications and experience. H. Neatby, Head,

Department of History, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

*SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY. Department of English.* Applications are invited for new positions in the Department of English at the levels of Associate and Full Professor. Current minima : \$11,700 and \$15,800. Appointments will be made during the next two years commencing in the summer of 1969. Applications with *curricula vitae*, including names and addresses of at least three referees should be addressed to Dr. E. F. Harden, Acting Head, Department of English, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby 2, British Columbia.

*TRENT UNIVERSITY.* Applications are invited for the following positions. *Chemistry* : associate or full professor, preferably with research interest in physical chemistry of biologically important macromolecules. *Apply* : Professor G. Aspinall, Chemistry Department.

*French Studies* : senior appointment for mature, highly respected scholar, to chair the department.

*Biology* : senior appointment, preferably quantitative ecologist, to chair the department.

*English* : senior appointment, to chair the Department of English Literature.

Applications are to be made to Dean T. E. W. Nind, except where noted. Salary and rank will be appropriate to qualifications and experience. 1968/69 minimum salaries are : Associate Professor \$12,600, Professor \$16,000. Appointments are to commence 1 July 1969. Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario.

*UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO History of Education.* Assistant Professor required to lecture in Canadian educational history or related field. Duties to commence July 1 or September 1, 1969. Favourable teaching load, research facilities, remuneration, and a close working arrangement with history department in faculty of arts. Candidates should have a background in history, and be familiar with historical and contemporary developments in Canadian education. Enquiries to : Robert M. Stamp, Chairman of History of Education Appointments Committee, Althouse College of Education, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

*Department of Sociology.* New positions open at the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor for sociologists with major

interests in deviance, demography, urban, institutions, and statistics. Teaching interests in introductory sociology and computer application in sociology will also receive special consideration. Favorable teaching load and university support for research. Application (including current *vita*) to : Edward Pryor, Jr., Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

*UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR. Department of English.* Applications are invited for positions as assistant or associate professors (\$10,000 - \$15,000), from specialists in the Romantic and Canadian areas. The Ph.D. degree plus some teaching experience and publication in field of specialization required. Write to Eugene McNamara, Head, Department of English, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

*School of Physical and Health Education.* Applications are invited for the following position : Sessional instructor required (male) on a one-year basis due to a sabbatical leave. Duties to commence September 1st, 1969. Duties will include the following : 1) Lecturing in the Honors B.P.H.E. degree program (Ancient and European History of Physical and Health Education). 2) Teach basic skills in the Honors B.P.H.E. program. 3) Supervise the men's intramural program. 4) Assist the Acting Athletic Director. Salary will be commensurate with experience and academic qualifications. Applications (including *curriculum vitae* and a recent photograph) should be addressed to : Professor P. J. Galasso, Director, School of Physical and Health Education, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

## NOTICE OF PERSONS AVAILABLE FOR APPOINTMENT \*\*

## ANNONCE DES PROFESSEURS DISPONIBLES \*\*

*Box 1. Physical Metallurgist.* Male, 42, Ph.D., 14 years' experience in R & D. Background : Annealing, Work-softening, Electrical properties of aluminum alloys, post-doctoral research in thermophysical properties of refractory metals at high temperatures. Desires teaching position. Résumé on request.

*Box 4. History.* Male 36, available to teach Canadian History (near Ph.D. from a Canadian university) or Renaissance-Reformation History (has Ph.D. from an American university). Has taught both and has published. Available Fall '69.

*Box 11. History.* Male, Canadian, family. Nineteenth century Britain, and also Europe. Ph.D. expected coming winter. Desires position for fall of 1969.

*Box 14. French.* Paris lady teacher, 35 years of age, 2 Sorbonne degrees (licence ès lettres, diplôme des Hautes Études Internationales), 12 years' experience teaching in French lycées, English grammar schools, American colleges and universities. Have taught in Paris, London, U.S.A. Would like position in English-speaking college or university. References.

*Box 16. French.* English university lecturer (First Class Honours B.A., Dunelm, D.Phil., Oxon.) with six years' teaching experience in the Department of French of an English university, seeks a university appointment in Canada. Special field Mediaeval Literature, but wide experience of teaching language and other periods of literature.

---

\*\* For fuller information write to the relevant Box No. at the C.A.U.T. National Office, 233 Gilmour Street, Suite 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario. Notices of person available for appointment are carried at \$3 for 40 words and \$4 for 50 words. Notices for insertion should be sent to the C.A.U.T. National Office.

\*\* Toute demande de renseignements doit être adressée au numéro indiqué du casier, secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U., 233, rue Gilmour, suite 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario.

Le taux de l'annonce est fixé à trois dollars pour quarante mots et quatre dollars pour cinquante mots. Les annonces doivent être envoyées au secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U.

*Box 17. English.* Man, married, 44. Ph.D. Twentieth Century British Literature. Strong fields 17th Century British Lit and Romantic periods. Extensive teaching experience at university level. Publications in scholarly journals. Preferences for graduate teaching, warmer climate and urban area. Wife qualified to teach Hindi. Looking for a place where wife may be able to teach at least on a part-time basis. Available in September 1969. *See also Box 18.*

*Box 18. Hindi.* Woman, 39, married, no children. Holds Master's degree in Hindi with background in Linguistics. Eight years' teaching experience at the College level. Willing to accept part-time position. Husband Ph.D. in English. Available in September, 1969. *See also Box 17.*

*Box 19. Chemistry.* Research Chemist, specialist in lipids, desires position in a department of Chemistry, or Biochemistry, or in related department such as Food Science or Nutrition. Approximately 48 research papers published. Ph.D., Organic Chemistry, Wayne State University, 1955. Postdoctoral research fellowship at University of Glasgow. Presently research group leader.

*Box 20. Economics.* Male, U.S. citizen, 34 years old, desires position teaching economics. Has M.A. in economics. Experience includes field work in N.Y.C. poverty areas, trade union staff member, and 3 years' teaching economics in U.S. colleges. Currently employed as assistant professor of economics at small U.S. college.

*Box 21. Economics.* Male, 35, Ph.D. 11 years' experience in India, U.S.A. and Canada. Presently working with Western Canadian University, seeks change. Have teaching experience in International Trade, Money & Banking, Labour Economics, Urban Economics, Consumer Economics, Public Finance, History of Economic Thought, Micro & Macro Economics, Comparative Economic Systems, Economic Development.

*Box 22. Materials Science.* Ph.D. Physical Metallurgy, male, 35, 7 years' university research and teaching experience. Publications. Available June 1969.

*Box 23. Biology.* Young biologist, Zoology B.Sc. ancillary Botany and Geology. 1st Class Honours. Ph.D. Entomology. Seeks teaching (lecturing or demonstrating) opportunities in biology (temporary or permanent).

*Box 24. Political Science.* Male, 25, single. B.A. (Hon.) Alberta. M.A. Wisconsin. Coursework for Ph.D. completed, University of Minnesota. Woodrow Wilson Fellow, 1965. Specialist in political philosophy; prepared to teach totalitarian systems and Anglo-American democracies. Article on justice accepted for publication. Canadian citizen. Available September 1969.

*Box 25. Chemistry.* Ph.D. Indian National, aged 39, seeks University/College teaching research position in Organic Chemistry or in Industry. Professional experience : 13 years' teaching & research experience in an Indian University. Postdoctoral 2 years in U.S.A. in Toxicology. Active research interest. Available January 1969.

*Box 26. Geology.* Geologist, 40, Ph.D., British, with 19 years' experience wide range mapping, mineralized areas, oil province, photogeology, geomorphology, sedimentology, publications. Seeks teaching/research position. Résumé on request.

*Box 27. Crystallography.* Italian National, Polyglot, seeks university position in Chemical-Physics at a chemistry or physics department. Six years assistant professor and lecturer in home country, plus five more years' research experience in Crystallography, with diffractometers and computers, in Holland and USA; fellowships and publications. Interests : crystal structure determination of complex compounds or organometallics of transition metals; relationship between physical properties and crystal structure; Point group theory. Available September 1969.

*Box 28. Entomology.* Entomologist, Ph.D., 28, B.Sc. 1st class honours Zoology. (London : Imperial College). Post doctoral experience. Research interests — Insect host plant relationships. Several papers submitted or in preparation.

*Box 29. History.* American History, Government, Politics, Culture. Student research supervision, Ph.D. (American Civilization : University of Pennsylvania, Harrison Fellow). 20 years' college teaching experience (now department chairman), plus government and civic work. Substantial publications. Full references. U.S. citizen, age 51. (Wife : M.S. in Library Science.) Sabbatical Leave : seeking one-year (perhaps longer term) appointment beginning summer or September 1969.

*Box 30. Geography.* Lecturer, male, 28, married. Australian Ph.D. completed. 5 years' teaching and research experience, publications.

Colombo Plan Adviser in Thailand, 1965-6; intending field experience in Indonesia and Malaysia, 1969. Special teaching interests Regional Southeast Asia, Agricultural Geography, Historical and Regional Australia-NZ, Introductory Physical. University appointment sought. Available September 1969. *Vita* available.

*Box 31. History.* History professor, 8 years' teaching experience (Modern European and Russian) seeks position in central or western Canada. Offers by junior college will be considered. Complete *curriculum vitae* and references on request.

*Box 32. English.* English and structural linguistics. Male, 37, with Ph.D., thirteen years' teaching experience, publications in literature and linguistics, wants a position starting September 1969 teaching both.

*Box 33. Biology.* Biologist, male, age 46, about 40 scientific papers, one book, teach ecology, mammalogy, comparative vertebrate anatomy, research interests arctic and subarctic ecology.

*Box 34. Psychology.* Man, 46, family, Ph.D., over 21 years' full-time teaching experience in departments of psychology, philosophy and several different great books programs at leading colleges and universities of many types and varieties : private, state, denominational, co-ed, men, women. Publications; some administrative experience; student counsellor nine years. Recent participation in pilot experimental semester. Seeks opportunity for innovative programs that relate classical texts and traditional skills and subjects with social sciences and current problems.

*Box 35. Political Science, Public Administration.* D.S.Sc. (Doctor of Social Science) Syracuse University, 37, married, one child, two years' college teaching experience, three years' governmental experience, former Resources for the Future Fellow, co-author of United Nations book, four publications, two professional conference papers presented. Desires university teaching position in general public administration with inter-disciplinary approach. Area of specialization is the public administration of natural resources. Available June 1969.

*Box 36. Engineering.* Mechanical engineer presently teaching in U.S.A. Ph.D. from West Virginia University. Major areas : Heat transfer, Thermodynamics and allied fields. Minor fields : Mathematics and Nuclear Engineering. References.

*Box 37. Slavic Linguistics and Literature.* Female, married, B.A. Hons. Russian language (UBC), M.A. Russian linguistics (UBC), Ph.D. candidate in Slavic linguistics (USA), with teaching experience. Desires teaching position at a university or college in Ontario.

*Box 38. French and Spanish Medievalist.* Young, male. Ph.D., married, college and university teaching experience in the USA, Canada and abroad, now doing research in Europe; some publications; looking forward to change of position.

*Box 39. Zoology.* Zoologist, Ph.D., 28 years, male, extensive research and teaching experience. Several publications. Desires teaching job in Canadian university, comparative anatomy, histology, developmental biology. Research interests: connective tissue metabolism.

*Box 40. German Language and Literature.* Ph. D., aged 34, specialized in 19th and 20th centuries. Teaching experience. Publications.

*Box 41. Organist-Recitalist-Theorist.* Desires challenging position in college or university. Master's degree plus substantial Doctoral study, Pupil of Dupré, Langlais, Maréchal, Boulanger, Premier Prix de Virtuosité (Schola Cantorum, Paris) 15 years' experience as organist and/or choirmaster, Fulbright Scholar.

*Case 42. Docteur ès Lettres.* Belge francophone, 30 ans, docteur ès Lettres (Université de Leiden), offre cours de linguistique générale-descriptive et de langues romanes. Perspectives d'emploi souhaitées pour son épouse, terminant actuellement un doctorat en Sciences (zoologie). Disponibles dès septembre 1969.

*Box 43. History.* At dissertation-writing stage graduate student looking for college-teaching position to teach modern European History specifically nineteenth century Germany. Teaching experience as assistant and visiting instructor. Also one year of study in Germany. B.A. 1964, M.A. 1965.

*Box 44. Slavic Studies.* Anthropology (Physical and Cultural), Anthropogeography, Slavistics.-L.Ph., D.Sc., Associate Professor, former Head of the Slavic Section, 17 years of experience, able to teach also French, German and Polish, seeks teaching and research position, available fall 1969. References and credentials to interested persons.



#### COMPARATIVE WALL ATLASSES

The comparative Wall Atlas style of map is popular because of the convenient size and the fact that only one phase of geography is dealt with in each map. The size of each map is 43 x 33 inches. The titles of the series on NORTH AMERICA are:

1. Relief of Land, Political and Communications.
2. Climate: Summer Conditions. Rainfall, Isobars, Winds.
3. Climate: Winter Conditions, Rainfall, Isobars, Winds.
4. Actual Temperature: July, and July Sea-level Isotherms.
5. Actual Temperature: January, and January Sea-level Isotherms.
6. Natural Vegetation.
7. Commercial Development.
8. Density of Population.

Supplementary map, Political and Communications, obtainable separately.

Other series available: Canada; South America; Europe; Asia; Africa; Australia and New Zealand; World-Relations; Commercial Development; British Isles; India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma; South Africa.

Mounted on cloth, dissected to fold with eyelets for hanging.

No. 30-11 — Single Maps, each	\$ 4.50
Any Eight Maps for	31.75
Style 9 — Any Eight Maps, on charthead with tripod stand, for	49.75

maps that display  
the chief facts  
of geography

These maps fulfill the requirement that "Maps should be used not only to locate places but to work out relationships between climate and vegetation, or between natural resources and population density."

\*A statement from the Introduction to the 1962 curriculum 1:7 x 1:9, Geography, History and Government Social Studies (Intermediate Division), Dept. of Education, Ontario.

**REGIONAL WALL MAPS — Physical/Political** — An up-to-date series of physical/political maps. Beautifully coloured to indicate the relief of the land, and sea depths. Communications, boundaries and other necessary details are included.

**FRANCE AND THE LOW COUNTRIES** — Eastward to Bremen and Turin, with inset of Corsica. 36 x 46 inches. Scale 1:1,250,000 (20 miles to 1 inch).

**CENTRAL EUROPE** — From Bornholm to Ljubljana, and Amsterdam to Brest. 46 x 36 inches. Scale 1:1,250,000 (20 miles to 1 inch).

**SCANDINAVIA** — From Hammerfest to Kiel, and Stavanger to Vyborg. 36 x 46 inches. Scale 1:1,750,000 (28 miles to 1 inch).

**THE NEAR EAST AND MIDDLE EAST** — From Kiev to Berbera, and Corfu to Muscat. 37 x 48 inches. Scale 1:4,000,000 (64 miles to 1 inch).

**THE MEDITERRANEAN LANDS** — 48 x 36 inches. Scale 1:4,000,000 (64 miles to 1 inch).

**THE FAR EAST** — From Irkutsk to Timor, and Chittagong to the Marianna Islands. 37 x 48 inches. Scale 1:6,500,000 (104 miles to 1 inch).

**GHANA** — 34 x 22 inches. Scale 1:1,000,000 (16 miles to 1 inch).

**NIGERIA** — 42 x 33 inches. Scale 1:1,400,000 (22 miles to 1 inch).

**CENTRAL AFRICA** — The Rhodesias, Nyasaland, and parts of bordering territories. 37 x 46 inches. Scale 1:1,750,000 (28 miles to 1 inch).

**EAST AFRICA** — Including the whole of Lakes Rudolph and Nyasa, with an inset extension of Port Herald. 36 x 48 inches. Scale 1:1,900,000 (30 miles to 1 inch).

**PACIFIC OCEAN** — 48 x 36 inches. Scale 1:20,000,000. Also available are Physical/Political maps of Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Jamaica. Size and scale comparable to those listed above.

**REGIONAL WALL MAPS — Political**

**WEST AFRICA** — From Nouakchott to Bata (Rio Muni), from Dakar to Lake Chad. 24½ x 37 inches. Scale 1:4,000,000 (64 miles to 1 inch).

**SOUTH-EAST ASIA** — From Canton to Darwin, Andaman Islands to Hollandia. 46 x 36 inches. Scale 1:5,000,000 (80 miles to 1 inch).

**WEST INDIES COMMITTEE MAP** — 48 x 37 inches. Scale 1:3,500,000 (55 miles to 1 inch).

**No. 30-12 Regional Wall Maps —**

**Style No. 11 — Mounted on wooden rods, each** 7.95

**Style No. 24 — Mounted on wooden spring** .....

13.25

**rollers, each** .....

**Style No. 9 — Any 8 maps, on charthead with** .....

57.75

**tripod stand, for** .....

**MOYER DIVISION VILAS INDUSTRIES LIMITED**

MONCTON - MONTREAL - TORONTO - WINNIPEG - SASKATOON - EDMONTON - VANCOUVER





